This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

AH 6A34 7

Digitized by Google

Period. 2006
V.18
1906-07

Digitized by Google

INDEX IN VOL 19
Between: pgs 98 - 9

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Original 2006
v.18
1906-07
See Unease Seminary Reviews

Volume XVIII. Number 1. 1

THE UNION SEMINARY MAGAZINE.

October—November, 1906.

CONTENTS.

The Unpardonable Sin, ... G. B. STRICKLER.
The Mystery of Sin and Suffering, ... JAMES A. QUARLES.
Despise Not The Chastening of The Lord, ... T. C. JOHNSON.
The Presbyterian-Cumberland Union, ... W. R. HENDERSON.
Praying The Lord of The Harvest, ... R. C. REED
Missions in The Sabbath-school, ... A. L. PHILLIPS.
The Rod of Aaron, ... RUSSELL CECIL.

EDITORIAL. REVIEWS.

RICHMOND, VA.:
UNION THEOLOCIGAL SEMINARY.
HUGH H. HUDSON, Business Manager.

Digitized by Google

$1.00 a year. Published Bi-monthly during Seminary Session. 25 cts. a copy.

Capitol Savings Bank

The Bank that Pays 4%

You will receive a cordial welcome at our bank. We will take care of your money while you are at College.

Checking and Savings Accounts Solicited

S. G. FAIRBANK, President
C. D. LARUS, Vice President
RO. M. KENT, Jr., Cashier

Very truly yours,
Capitol Savings Bank,
907 E. Main St.

ESTABLISHED 1867

Take your Insurance with the

Union Central Life Insurance Company

of Cincinnati, Ohio

IT pays the LARGEST DIVIDENDS, thereby furnishing the CHEAPEST INSURANCE.

¶ You get the profits each year to REDUCE the amount you pay, or to INCREASE the face of your policy.

¶ Drop a card to, or call on the undersigned, stating age, and the figures and advantages of our best policy will be given you :: :: :: :: ::

R. S. TUCK, General Agent
34-36-38-40 Chamber of Commerce
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

Special Agent at Seminary
R. C. DEAL

Digitized by Google

Period. 2006
V. 18
1906-07

ANDOVER-HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

THE
Union Seminary Magazine

VOL. XVIII OCTOBER—NOVEMBER, 1906 No. 1

THE UNPARDONABLE SIN.*

BY REV. GIVENS B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D.
Union Theological Seminary.

In the immediately preceding context, the apostle is discussing the subject of prayer. "And this is the confidence we have in him, that if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us; and if we know that he hear us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of him. If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death." He then adds the text: "There is a sin unto death. I do not say that he shall pray for it." What that sin is, he does not tell us. How those to whom he was writing might know when one had committed it, and so not pray for him, he does not inform us. Perhaps they had information on the subject of which he gives us no account. But, however that may be, what it concerns us to observe is, that the text plainly teaches that there is a sin that is unpardonable; a sin in regard to which no prayer is to be offered; a sin that crosses the "mysterious boundary that separates between God's patience and his wrath," and irretrievably dooms the soul to eternal death.

This solemn truth is taught in many other passages in these pages. It is taught in the Old Testament, as, for instance, by the Prophet Isaiah. When that prophet was commissioned to preach to his countrymen, he was informed beforehand that they would hear, indeed, but that they would not understand; that they would see, but that they would not perceive; that the only effect of his preaching on them would be that their eyes would grow dull, and their ears grow heavy, and their hearts wax fat;

*A sermon preached in the Seminary Chapel December, 1905.

Digitized by Google

that, indeed, in righteous retribution for their past abuse of the truth, it was not intended that it should have any other effect on them, and that, therefore, only a remnant of them would be saved. It is taught, also, by the prophet Hosea: "Let Ephraim alone; he is joined to his idols." The reference is to the tribe of Ephraim, which, because of its size and importance, is taken as the representative of the Northern Kingdon. "Let him alone. He has wholly given himself up to the grossest idolatry. In spite of all the instructions and warnings that have been given him, 'he is joined to his idols.' Make no further efforts in his behalf. Leave him to his fate." In such passages as these is this alarming truth taught in the Old Testament.

It is taught, also, in the New Testament. In the Gospel of Mark, our Saviour says: "All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme; but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation;" or, as it is in the original, "is guilty of an eternal sin;" a sin whose guilt shall never be extinguished. Concerning his betrayal by Judas Iscariot, he said, "it had been good for that man if he had never been born"—a declaration that could be true, of course, only on the supposition that he would never be saved. Over the inhabitants of Jerusalem he exclaimed: "O that thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things that belong unto thy peace; but now they are hid from thine eyes." In the sixth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews it is said, "it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh and put him to an open shame." And in the tenth chapter of the same Epistle it is said, "if we sin wilfully after that we have received a knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation that shall devour the adversaries." Thus, in a number of passages in the Old Testament and in the New, it is taught that "there is a sin unto death;" a sin in respect of which prayer is not to be offered; a sin for which no pardon has been provided.

Digitized by Google

Indeed, at first view, there would seem to be a number of such sins. I suppose that a casual consideration of the different passages I have just quoted would make the impression on almost any one, not only that each one of them makes mention of "a sin that is unto death," but that each one of them makes mention of a different "sin that is unto death." In the case of the Israelites, to whom Isaiah preached, it would seem to be taught that there is an indifference and insensibility to truth that is "a sin unto death." In the case of the tribe of Ephraim, it would seem to be taught that there is an idolatry that is "a sin unto death." In the case of the Jews mentioned by our Saviour in the Gospel of Mark, it would seem to be taught, and is taught, that there is a blasphemy against the Holy Ghost that is "a sin unto death." In the case of Judas Iscariot, it would seem to be taught that there is a betrayal of the Lord Jesus Christ that is "a sin unto death." In the case of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, it would seem to be taught that there is a failure to improve seasons of gracious visitation that is "a sin unto death." In the case of those mentioned in the sixth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it would seem to be taught that there is a falling away from great spiritual influences and privileges that is "a sin unto death;" and in the case of those mentioned in the tenth chapter of the same epistle, it would seem to be taught that there is a wilful sinning against clear light that is "a sin unto death." Thus, I doubt not that, at first view, these different passages would make the impression on almost any one, not only that each one of them make mention of "a sin unto death," but that each one makes mention of a different "sin that is unto death;" and no doubt that would be the conclusion after the most careful consideration, if the Saviour and the text did not so definitely assert that there is but *one* sin of this dreadful character.

But while there is but one "sin that is unto death," it is manifest, and it is a truth that it profoundly concerns us to observe, that this one sin presents itself in the Scriptures under a number of different forms. In the case of Isaiah's countrymen, it presented itself under the form of profound indifference and insensibility to the truth. In the case of the Ephraimites, it presented itself under the form of gross and obstinate idolatry. In the case of certain Jews, it presented itself under the form of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. In the case of Judas Iscariot,

Digitized by Google

it presented itself under the form of a shameful betrayal of the Lord Jesus Christ. In the case of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, it presented itself under the form of an utter failure to improve seasons of gracious visitation. In the case of those mentioned in the sixth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it presented itself under the form of a total falling away from great spiritual privileges and influences; and in the case of those mentioned in the tenth chapter of that Epistle, it presents itself under the form of wilful sinning against clear light. It is manifest that the sin presents itself in the Scriptures under all these different forms, because all these sins are expressly declared to be sins unto death, and yet, at the same time, it is plainly taught both by our Saviour and the text that there is but *one* sin that is "a sin unto death."

Now, in what respect these sins, apparently so different, are all one; by what profound and controlling trait they are all gathered up into the dreadful unity of the single sin of the text, it is, I suppose, impossible to point out. Certainly there is little agreement among those who have made the attempt. The fact seems to be that God, in his Word, intentionally leaves the nature of the sin so obscure that it can not be accurately defined; and that he does this for at least two reasons:

One is that we have no right to know what it is, nor when it will be reached in the path of sinful progress. Suppose there were somewhere on our Atlantic coast a dreadful maelstrom that no one could approach with safety. Suppose, however, at the same time, that none of our citizens had any right upon that portion of our high seas; that no duty called them thither; that no interest demanded their presence there; that for some reason, no matter what, they could not go thither without violating the laws of our country; would the government of our country, in such circumstances, be under any obligation to have prepared a chart of that portion of our high seas distinctly pointing out the latitude and longitude of that maelstrom, and indicating just how near it might be approached with safety from the different points of the compass? Certainly not; and to any demand for such information on the part of any of its citizens, the government might well respond: "You have no business on that part of the ocean. No legitimate interest of any kind demands your presence there; as you well know, you can not go thither

Digitized by Google

without disregarding the authority of your government; and the very fact that you are seeking the information you now demand, seems to indicate you want to do something you have no right to do, and are trying to find out how you may do it with safety." Well, so no one has any right to know where this deadly sin is in the wide domain of rebellion against God. No one has any right to enter that domain; he has no right to enter it at a single point; he has no right to take a single step into it; and, therefore he has no right to know just how he may enter it, and just where he may enter it, and just how far he may go into it, without encountering this sin and incurring its fatal consequences. God does not give us this knowledge, then, because we have no right to it.

The other reason why he does not give us this knowledge is, that it would be grossly abused. Who does not know that if this sin were distinctly defined in the Scriptures and the point plainly marked out where it is reached in the path of sinful progress, the great mass of men would go boldly forward in transgression until they came right up to it, knowing that they could do it without forfeiting the hope of salvation? The nature of this sin, then, and its location, are concealed in the Scriptures, that men, not knowing certainly what it is, nor where it is, nor how soon they may reach it, may be deterred from going any further in the direction in which it is known to lie. If a husbandman (as William Jay once suggested in substance,) wished to protect an orchard of valuable fruit from depredation, he might employ a pitfall for that purpose, and he might give notice by placards around the enclosure that he was employing that means for his protection; but he would not tell where the pitfall was, for then the depredators could easily avoid it, and enter the orchard at other points. But he would keep its location a secret with himself, that they might be afraid to enter it at any point, lest the very point at which they should enter should be the point of danger. Well, so it may be said that God seeks to protect the domain of his rights from invasion, and employs this sin as a kind of dreadful pitfall for the purpose; a pitfall on which, if any man steps, he plunges through into a hopeless eternity; and, not being willing that any should perish, he again and again gives notice in his Word that he is employing it for that purpose; but he does not tell just where it is. If he did, men would boldly and defiantly trample all over that domain, except right on that

Digitized by Google

fatal spot. But he keeps the location of it as one of the secrets that belong unto himself, that men may be afraid to invade that domain at any point, lest the very point of invasion should be the point of doom. For such reasons as these God has not told us precisely what the sin is, nor where it is, nor just how it may be committed.

But I now add, that, while he has not done this, he has graciously given us information about the sin of the most important character. He has plainly pointed out how we may know when we are approaching it. In other words, he, in his Word, names a number of sins of such a sort that pressed far enough—and we know not how far is sufficient—pass into the sin of the text and incur its doom; and to some of these sins I wish now to call your attention.

1. He teaches that indifference and insensibility to the truth, pressed far enough, becomes the sin of the text, and so "a sin unto death." This, as we have seen, was the sin of the Israelites to whom Isaiah preached. Their ears were so dull; their eyes were so heavy; their hearts were so irresponsive to the truth, that even such preaching as Isaiah's made no salutary impression on them; and it was fatal to them. Thus men may, under the preaching of the truth, so stifle the right emotions of the heart that they shall practically be destroyed, and then one of the most dreadful declarations of the Scriptures becomes true of them: they are *"past feeling."* I heard a chaplain in the Confederate Army once say that during the war a surgeon was examining the wounded arm of a soldier, and he pricked it near the wrist, and asked him if he felt it. "No," he answered. He pricked it higher up. "Do you feel that?" "No." He pricked still higher up. "Do you feel that?" "No." He pricked it near the shoulder joint. "Do you feel that?" "No." The surgeon then turned, he said, to a friend standing by and whispered, "he is a dead man. He is past feeling." What was thus true of a portion of that soldier's body, may become true of the soul. It is with the sensibilities of the soul as it is with the organs of the body. A man may, for instance, abuse his eyes to a certain degree, and still be able to see, but let him carry the abuse too far, and, no matter what the consequences may be, he will never see again. So a man may resist and suppress the sensibilities of his soul under the truth for awhile in some measure, and still those sensibilities may

Digitized by Google

struggle for expression, but let him carry the irrational violence too far, and he will never feel again as he ought to feel, but his fate will be as certainly sealed as was that of many of the Israelities. He may afterwards "hear" the truth, but he will not "understand." He may "see," but he will not "perceive."

Are there any present who are indifferent and insensible to the truth? Does it arouse in your minds no serious thoughts; in your hearts no serious emotions? And has this been true of you for months, for years? I would not be faithful to you if I did not warn you that you are on the direct road to the sin of the text and no one knows how soon you may reach it!

2. God teaches that idolatry is a sin of such a sort that, pressed far enough, becomes the sin of the text. This, as we have seen, was the sin of the tribe of Ephraim. Notwithstanding all the instruction and warning they had received, they were not only guilty of idolatry, but they were so "joined" to their idols, that God forbad any further efforts in their behalf. He abandoned them to their fate. Thus their sin became the sin of the text.

Idolatry, however, has not disappeared from the earth. Men have not ceased to be "joined to idols;" for in what does the sin essentially consist? It essentially consists in bestowing upon some other being that worship which is due to God alone. But what is worship? How do we worship God? We worship him when we fix our thoughts upon him; when we fix our affections upon him; when we seek him; when we trust him; when we delight in him; when we serve him. When, then, these exercises of soul are bestowed supremely on any other object, that is idolatry. But every unconverted person bestows these exercises of mind and heart supremely on secular good in some of its different forms. Does he not fix his thoughts on it more than he does upon God? Does he not fix his affections on it more than he does upon God? Does he not seek it more than he does God? Does he not trust in it to supply his wants more than he does in God? Does he not delight in it more than he does in God? Does he not serve it more than he does God, in the sense that he puts forth more effort to secure its ministrations than he does to secure God's favor? His own consciousness distinctly tells him that he does, and thus, in God's sight, he is as truly an idolator as if he bowed down to stocks or stones? He is as truly an idolator as if he kissed his hand to Ashtoreth or offered incense to the moon.

Digitized by Google

Every unconverted person, then, is an idolator. And now, if any one has been guilty of this sin for years—for twenty, thirty, forty, fifty years—is there no danger that the time may be near when God will say in regard to him, what he said in regard to Ephraim: "let him alone. He is joined to his idols?"

3. God teaches that the sin of rejecting Christ is a sin of such a sort that, pressed far enough, becomes the sin of the text. This, we know, was the sin of the Jews. Although "he was holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners;" although "he spake as never man spake;" although he gave sight to the blind, and hearing to the deaf, and speech to the dumb, and health to the sick, and life to the dead; although he furnished to them these and other incontestable proofs that he was what he claimed to be, their long-predicted and long-expected Messiah, they nevertheless rejected him; not only rejected him but insulted him; spat on him; scourged him, and, at last, put him to death between two thieves, as though he were a greater criminal than either of them. Thus did they reject him, and it was fatal to them. Rejected by them, he rejected them, and thus their sin became the sin of the text.

But men are still rejecting him, and in circumstances less excusable, perhaps than were those of the Jews. Most men now in christian countries know more about him than the Jews knew. They know more about his Person than the Jews knew. Many of the Jews thought he was a mere man. Many who are rejecting him at the present day know that he is "God manifest in the flesh." They know more about his character than the Jews knew. Many of the Jews thought he was an imposter and "a ringleader of sedition." Those who now reject him know that "he was holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners." They know more about the kingdom he came to establish in the world than the Jews knew. The Jews thought he had come to establish a great earthly kingdom. Those who now reject him know that he came to establish that glorious spiritual kingdom of which the Scriptures have so much to say. They know more about the meaning of his death than the Jews knew. They thought his death was the deserved penalty of violated law. Those who now reject him know that his death was a "propitiation for the sins of the whole world;" and so in many other respects. Thus, those who now reject him know much more about

Digitized by Google

him than the Jews knew. Therefore this solemn question presses for an answer: If their persistent rejection of him, with less knowledge, was so fatal to them, why should not the persistent rejection of him by multitudes at the present day, with greater knowledge, be equally fatal to them? Is there no danger that many are pushing this sin, as the Jews did, beyond the limits of God's patience and forbearance?

The unconverted, however, may say: "After all, our rejection of Christ is very different from that of the Jews. They shed his blood and put him to death. We certainly have not done that." That, of course, is true; and yet there is not that difference between their rejection of Christ and the Jews' rejection which they may imagine. They have not, indeed, shed his blood, but how have they treated it since it was shed, and shed that they might be saved? The Scriptures say they are trampling it under their feet; and if that be true, I suppose Christ would about as soon have had them shed his blood, as to have them thus, after it has been shed, trample it under their feet as they do the common dirt on which they walk. They have not put him to death, but how have they treated him since he was put to death, and put to death that they might live? The Scriptures represent that they are practically "crucifying him afresh." But if that be true, I suppose he would about as soon have had them crucify him in the first instance as to have them thus crucify him in this second instance, especially as the first crucifixion, painful as it was, was all over in a few hours, while this second crucifixion is repeated, continued, protracted, cruelly stretched out through months and years! There is no great difference, then, between Christ's rejection then and now; and, therefore, the solemn question may be repeated: If the Jews, with their less knowledge of him, pressed this sin so far that it became fatal to them, why may not men, with their greater knowledge of him, be guilty of the same disastrous folly at the present day?

4. God teaches that a failure to improve seasons of gracious visitation is a sin of such a sort that, pressed too far, becomes the sin of the text. This was the sin of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. For years they had had in their city the temple of God, and the oracles of God; the priests and their sacrifices; and prophet after prophet had been sent to them, and latterly Christ himself had preached the gospel in their streets. They had thus

Digitized by Google

had every needed means of salvation, but they had not improved these seasons of gracious visitation, and, therefore, the Saviour wept over their folly, and exclaimed: "O that thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things that belong to thy peace; but now they are hid from thine eyes."

But men are still failing to improve seasons of gracious visitation? Often the truth makes upon them a profound impression. Their minds are enlightened; their consciences are awakened; their affections are moved; their fears are alarmed. They are almost persuaded to become Christians. They have every advantage, at least, that the ancient inhabitants of Jerusalem had, and yet many of them as signally fail properly to improve their opportunities as they did. Ought they not greatly to fear that the final result will be the same?

5. There is time to mention, in a word, only one more sin, that, pressed too far, becomes the sin of the text. "If we sin wilfully," says the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, "after we have received a knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation that shall devour the adversaries." Thus sinning against clear light may be carried so far as to become "a sin unto death." But are not multitudes deliberately and obstinately sinning against clear light? Are they not sinning against all the light of reason; all the light of conscience; all the light of nature; all the light of God's Word? Did the sun ever at noon-day pour down upon this world a clearer light than that light against which multitudes are every day wilfully sinning? Are they running no risk, then, of committing the dreadful sin of the text?

We thus see, that, according to the Scriptures, there are a number of sins, that, pressed too far, merge into the sin of the text. We should now observe that of all these sins every unconverted person is guilty. He is indifferent and insensible to the truth; he is an idolator in the sense explained; he rejects Christ; he has failed to improve seasons of gracious visitation and he wilfully sins against clear light. Thus, in all these different ways, he is running the risk of committing the sin of the text. Dr. Addison Alexander, describing this sin said:

Digitized by Google

"There is a time we know not when;
A place, we know not where;
That marks the destiny of men
To glory or despair.

"There is a line by us unseen,
That crosses every path,
The hidden boundary between
God's patience and His wrath."

To cross that limit is to die. And many of the unconverted, as if to make sure of crossing it, are pressing forward to it, not by one route simply, but a number of different routes! Is not this a fact of which it profoundly concerns them to take account?

In conclusion, I make just two brief remarks:

1. If any one wishes to know whether he has committed this sin, he has but to inquire whether he is truly concerned about his spiritual welfare. If he has a sense of sin and of its ill desert, and a desire to be delivered from it, and to obtain the favor of God, that is evidence that the Spirit of God is still in his heart, and that, therefore, he has not been abandoned. But if he is wholly indifferent to the subject of religion, and has been for years, it is impossible to say what is true of him. He is certainly in great peril.

2. It is important to observe, that, while there is a sin that in a special sense is a sin unto death, it is to be remembered that any sin that men commit may at any moment become as fatal as that sin is. There are diseases of the body for which there is no cure. They always result fatally. There are other diseases for which there are cures; but those diseases for which there are cures will, some of them, just as certainly prove fatal as the diseases for which there are no cures, unless the cures are used. So, while there is but one sin for which there is no remedy, and while for all other sins there is an all-sufficient remedy, those sins for which there is a remedy will just as certainly prove fatal as the sin for which there is no remedy, unless the remedy is employed. Let no one imagine, then, that he is in no special peril because he has not committed the sin of the text. Any other sin, through the sudden intervention of death, may at any moment become as fatal as that sin is. Let him, therefore, with all haste and earnestness, "flee for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before him" in the gospel.

Digitized by Google

THE MYSTERY OF SIN AND SUFFERING.

By Rev. James A. Quarles, D. D., LL. D.
Washington and Lee University.

The mystery of sin and suffering in a God-ruled world, troubled the mind of Job, of the Psalmist, of Habakkuk, of Jeremiah, and probably of Adam, and of all the patriarchs and prophets and apostles. That sin and suffering are realities, every honest, thoughtful person knows, from the teachings of his own experience, to say nothing of his observation.

The mystery deepens as we witness many cases of sin without suffering. This is the problem which agonizes the lover of truth and righteousness, "wherefore do the wicked live, become old, yea, wax mighty in power; the tents of robbers prosper, and they that provoke God are secure;" Job xii. 6; xxi. 7. That minister of wickedness, Leopold, wears the crown of Belgium, disports himself as a gentleman of leisure in the gay salons of Europe, and is reputed the richest man upon the Continent; despite the fact that his emissaries are torturing and murdering the poor Africans of the Congo, that they may be terrorized into heaping up his overful coffers with gold.

The mystery is at its climax, when we see instance after instance of suffering without sin; unusual suffering not due to the sin of the sufferer. Dreyfus, loyal to his flag, true to his country, and yet degraded as a traitor, and caged like a wild beast on a rock in the torrid seas. Jesus, the immaculate, the Saviour; and yet betrayed, forsaken, condemned as a blasphemer and a traitor, reviled, buffeted, spit upon, scourged, crucified.

Has Atheism, in any of its forms, Materialism, Pantheism, Agnosticism, a solution to this problem? It is the answer of despair; as some of its disciples affirm that all evil, sin, and suffering, are an accident, a chance; while others, more thoughtful, lay it to necessity, the inevitable working of iron law.

What has Christianity to say upon this unsolved problem of the universe?

Digitized by Google

1. Christianity teaches that *Man* does not and *cannot know* the *secret* things of *God*. "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? Job xi. 7. 'The secret things belong unto the Lord our God." Deut. xxix. 29. "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter." Jno. xiii. 7. "For we know in part, and we prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away. For now we see in a mirror darkly; but then face to face; now I know in part; but then shall I know fully, even as also I was fully known." 1 Cor. xiii. 9, 10, 12. Yet "vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass's colt." Job. xi. 12. Our children puzzle their brains in vain endeavor to understand us; the untutored rustic stands in stupefied wonder in the midst of the palaces and factories of the city; and even the philosopher comes to pondering pause before the mysteries of space and time and being. So the devout and sober thinker often kneels at the feet of Jehovah and humbly says, "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight."

II. Christianity teaches that *God* is *omnipotent;* that "none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou? He doeth according to his will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth." Dan. iv. 35. That God is infinitely *wise*: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God," Rom. xi. 33. That God is infinitely *holy* and *just,* "Righteous and true are thy ways, thou King of the ages. Who shall not fear and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy." Rev. xv. 3, 4. That God is infinitely *gracious,* loving and merciful: "Jehovah, Jehovah, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abundant in loving kindness and truth; keeping loving kindness for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7. Though sin is that abominable thing which God hates, Jer. xliv. 4, *he allowed the serpent* to enter the garden and beguile Eve, Gen. iii. 1-6. Though "God is love," 1 Jno. iv. 8, 16, he permitted Satan to rob Job of his property, of his children, of his health, of the sympathy of his wife, and the respect of his friends.

III. Christianity teaches that *sin antedates human history* and existed before the creation of man. Its origin is not distinctly stated; but we are led to believe that sin began with the devil, or Satan; that he was an inhabitant of heaven; that he and his

Digitized by Google

angels waged a war of insurrection there, and that they were cast out and went forth to deceive the inhabitants of the earth, Rev. xii. 7-12. The devil is "the great dragon," "the old serpent," who successfully tempted Eve and brought sin and suffering into our world. So sin is first seen in heaven, and had its beginning among men in the holy, happy atmosphere of Eden. God made man pure, free from sin and suffering; he allowed the devil to make him sinful and miserable. Christianity had nothing to do with the introduction of sin and suffering into the universe or into this world. It did not make man a sinful sufferer; but it came to him because he was a sinful sufferer. "Faithful is the saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." 1 Tim. i. 15. He came not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. Jno. iii. 17. *God made man holy and happy; the devil has made him sinful and miserable; and Christ has come to make him again holy and happy.*

IV. Christianity teaches that God made man a happy, sinless, free, moral, *responsible agent.* God might have made the universe lifeless, and there would have been suns and planets and moons and comets and meteors, and seas and hills and valleys and streams and air and ether, and light and heat and sound and electricity; and altogether it would have been a grand universe. He might have done this, and added to it all the wonders of life, as he has done; clothing the earth in a living coat of many colors and making it buoyant with fish and beast and bird. More than this, he might have introduced intelligence in addition to life; not only of the kind and degree with which he has endowed the dog and the horse and the elephant; but intelligence capable of discovering and demonstrating all the relations of quantity in the mathematics; all the laws and phenomena of matter, organic and inorganic; all the intricacies of number, gender, case, person, mood and tense in language; and even the deepest of all the profundities of metaphysics. Then the heavens would have declared the glory of God, and the earth would have been full of his riches, and the mathematician, the scientist, the linguist, the philosopher would have crowned it all. But it would not have been the universe as it is, the world as God made it; the agnels, the devil, man, would not have been here. It pleased God to add soul, spirit, *conscience* to life and intelligence.

Digitized by Google

Life, with its growth and movement, is beautiful and marvelous; intelligence, with its discernment, is more so; but soul, with its knowledge of right and wrong, its ability to choose, is the pearl of greatest price. So God made man a conscience, knowing good and evil, and endowed with the power, involving the responsibility, of choice, of will, to take the one or the other as he saw fit; ability to choose right or wrong, truth or error, good or evil, virtue or vice, sin or holiness. In the exercise of this freedom, man chose to sin, and thus brought death into the world and all our woes. God said to man: "I have set before thee life and death, the blessing and the curse; therefore choose life, that thou mayst live, thou and thy seed." Deut. xxx. 19. But, alas, *man,* made a happy, sinless, free, moral, responsible agent, *chose sin* and *suffering.*

V. Christianity teaches that *sin and suffering shall give way to holy happiness.* It has two statements on this point:

1. That *sin* shall be properly *punished* and *virtue* adequately *rewarded;* that there shall be no sin without suffering to the sinner, and no suffering without sin in the sufferer. Here it is often otherwise, but in the coming world all this shall be rectified. Here virtue often lies in rags, tortured with sores and sorrows, craving to be fed with the crumbs that fall from the rich man's table; while vice lives in a palace, clothed in purple and fine linen, and faring sumptuously every day. But death lifts the curtain of eternity, and Lazarus is seen happy in Abraham's bosom; while Dives, craving a drop of water to cool his tongue, is addressed by Abraham, "Thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and Lazarus likewise evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented." Luke xvi. 25.

2. Moreover, Christianity teaches that sin and suffering shall have an *end in this world.* "We look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." 2 Pet. iii. 13. "Thy people also shall be all righteous." Isa. lx. 21. "For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of Jehovah, as the waters cover the sea." Hab. ii. 14. "They shall beat their swords into plow-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Mic. iv. 3. Paul assures us that when "the fulness of the Gentiles shall come in," "all Israel shall be saved." Rom. xi. 25, 26. It shall be a glad day, when earth's ransomed millions shall bow to the scepter of their Saviour King.

Digitized by Google

VI. The chief purpose of this paper is to present two additional thoughts. Christianity teaches that *sin and suffering develop and enrich the character of man;* man without them would be poorer; with them he is richer. 1. In our relation to *ourselves.* The consciousness of personal *sin* makes and keeps us humble and contrite. It teaches us patience and toleration toward others. It induces a sense of dependence upon God's gracious Spirit and a desire for constant communion with him. The assurance, which Christianity gives us that God freely pardons all our sins for Christ's sake, accepts us as his children, and makes us his heirs, melts our hearts with grateful love and makes us strive to be and do what pleases our Father and our Redeemer. The promise that we shall be more than conquerors through him that loved us, encourages us to fight the good fight of faith, to lay aside every weight and the sins that beset us, and perfect holiness in the fear of God. The lifelong struggle with sin and Satan, inward depravity and outward temptation, gives exercise to our moral nature, making us spiritually vigorous and fibrous, strong in the Lord and in the power of his might. So this personal experience with sin induces humility, penitence, faith, courage, moral and spiritual strength.

Our personal connection with *suffering* is also conducive to our soul's enrichment. So Christianity clearly and repeatedly teaches. "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. Fathers of our flesh chasten us as seem good to them, but he for our profit, that we may be partakers of his holiness." Heb. xii. 6, 10. It is here distinctly stated that our suffering is a result and evidence of God's love to us, and is designed for our good. That suffering may be and is profitable to those who rightly receive and use it is manifest; for its proper endurance makes us humble, penitent, self-denying, patient, submissive, sympathetic, tender, strong. A secondary effect of suffering we must not overlook in our increased appreciation of the joys of life when we are relieved from suffering. "Spring would be but gloomy weather, if we had nothing else but spring." Recognizing our need of chastisement, there is a flow of gratitude when God mercifully spares us further affliction.

That personal experience with sin and suffering does develop and strengthen the character of those that rightly meet them, is

Digitized by Google

seen all around us, if it be not gratefully recognized within us. When, upon Memorial Day, we deck the graves of our patriot dead, the flowers are not placed upon the bosoms of those that did not go to the tented and ensanguined field, but upon those that bared their breasts to the struggle, and returned bronzed and bruised and scarred from the deadly conflict. So, the moral hero is not the man, born and bred away from scenes of temptation, and that lives sheltered from danger in the seclusion of the cloister; but it is Jere Macaulay, a wharf thief and penitentiary convict, rising in the might of his moral manhood and trusting to the grace of God, resolved to battle Satan to the death, and crowned a victor amid the plaudits of men and angels. Jesus, the captain of our salvation, was made perfect through suffering, and his redeemed are they that come out of great tribulation and wash their robes in the blood of the Lamb. Rev. vii. 14.

> "God in Israel sows the seeds
> Of affliction, pain and toil;
> These spring up and choke the weeds,
> Which would else o'erspread the soil."

2. So much for the developing influence of sin and suffering from our personal experience of them. They are equally powerful in their effects upon us in our *relations to other* sinners and sufferers. It is interesting to think how the absence of evil from the world would affect mankind; what a marked effect it would produce upon the employments of men. If there were no ignorance, there would be no teachers; if there were no sickness, there would be no doctors; if there were no crimes, there would be no lawyers; if there were no sinners, there would be no preachers. All of these important classes are professionally engaged with sin and suffering. It is true, moreover, that no useful person fails to do what he can to relieve the sins and sorrows of others; and in this he finds his highest and most coveted employment. Every man ought to be, and is, in some way, and to some degree a teacher to inform and train his fellows; a physician to heal their hurts and minister to their needs; a lawyer, to aid in the promotion of justice between man and man; and a preacher, a messenger of God's grace, to reclaim the wanderer and to set the fallen upon his feet again. But the special point of interest here is that in proportion to our exertion for the re-

Digitized by Google

lief of others from ignorance, suffering, and sin, our own minds are enlightened, and our own moral natures are purified, elevated and toned.

The result is that God's people, Christ's redeemed, the sacramental host of God's elect, pass from this life stronger, more virtuous, more Christlike by reason of their conflict with temptation and their baptism of sorrow, than if they had died in the innocence of infancy, or had been sheltered from trial and pain all their days. Paul is the typical, ideal Christian. He gives us an epitome of his stormy life in 2 Cor. xi. 23-28. As we read this brief recital of his tragic experiences, we wonder that he survived them to give his neck to the headsman's axe, after he had spent three score years in the seventimes heated furnace of persecution. We stand with uncovered head as we hear him say at the end: "I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness;" and we follow him from the martyr's block,

> "As guided by angels he speeds on his way
> Through the portals of praise to the temple of light,"

and see him assigned his place at the front of the blood-washed throng, nearest to the throne of God and the Lamb; "the chief of sinners," 1 Tim. i. 15; "saved by grace." 1 Cor. xv. 10. We prostrate ourselves in adoring wonder, as we see the uncrowned angels that never sinned, gathered at a distance around the throne; while the spirits of the just, made perfect in their struggle with sin and suffering, stand nearer than they, each wearing a crown and waving the palm of victory; their Elder Brother, their crucified Redeemer on the throne, and they themselves *judging the angels.* 1 Cor. vi. 3.

VII. But, finally, while sin and suffering exalt man in character and condition above the angels, the even more important truth is that they *exalt God.* Satan has only a seeming, temporary triumph. 'Tis true, he has steeped man's soul in wickedness and deluged him with sorrow, and flaunts his banner of defiant triumph in the face of Jehovah. But he that sitteth in the heavens laughs, the Lord has him in derision. Ps. ii. 4. For a little span of three-score years and ten he may vex Job and Lazarus, and lead astray David and Peter; but Jesus and the gra-

Digitized by Google

cious Spirit comfort and strengthen them in the days of their suffering pilgrimage, while they resist the devil and trust Jehovah; and after life's fitful fever is over they enter upon the unalloyed, perfect, blissful service of their Lord forever and forever. Satan has partial possession of this world for the moment of time; Jesus has the full sway of the world to come for the endless ages of eternity.

Sin directly and *specially honors God.* It honors him in the display of his justice in the condemnation and punishment of Satan and his apostate satellites. It honors him in the protection of the angels from the pollution of its power. It honors him in the contrast between the holy happiness of heaven and the horrible hoodlumism of hell. It honors him in the gracious rescue of man from its dominion and his restoration to Christlike purity and seraphic joy. Most of all, it honors him in the display of his infinite love to the sinner. Had there been no sin, there had been no Gethsemane, no Calvary, no sympathising, suffering Saviour; no gentle, patient, wooing, winning, uplifting, sanctifying Spirit; no gracious, pardoning, welcoming, blessing Father. Had there been no sin, heaven would have had no redeemed, blood-washed throng to gather about the throne, casting their crowns at the feet of Jesus and singing the new song: "Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests;" while every creature cries: "Blessing and honor and glory and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever"; and the angels fall before the throne on their faces and worship God, saying, "Amen; Blessing and glory and wisdom and thanksgiving and honor and power and might, be unto our God forever and ever. Amen." Rev. v. 9, 10, 13; and vii. 11, 12.

The tragedy of sin and suffering has for its denouement the holy happiness, the enriched, perfected character of man, and the triumphant glory of God.

Digitized by Google

DESPISE NOT THE CHASTENING OF THE LORD.

By Rev. Thomas Cary Johnson, D. D., LL. D.
Union Theological Seminary.

"My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord."

These words, appropriated from the Proverbs, were addressed by the writer of the letter before us to the people of a far-off land, a remote age and a persecuting era. Around them persisted the influences of an effete heathen civilization. In their hearts still throbbed a love for the venerable, the Divinely-given but now superceded and no longer significant forms of the Mosaic dispensation. Against them, because of their love for Christ, were arrayed the heathen, with contemptuous hate, and the Jews with hostile malignity. Their sufferings, already heavy, were like to be heavier. Persecutions *unto blood and death* were close before them.

Our circumstances are very different from theirs. Ours is another clime and another country. If the present persecutions of a communion which would still bear the name of Cumberland Presbyterian, and similar persecutions during and after the time of the war between the sections, of one party of Christians by another party of Christians in collusion with civil power, suggest the earlier and the dark ages of Church history, we are justified, nevertheles, in asserting that we were born amidst prepossessions in favor of Christianity and of Christian liberty. In our day, and in our country, the world does not attack the Church with fagot, Roman cross and savage beasts. Persecutions unto blood are not likely to be the portion of any of us as long as we remain in our homeland, no matter how valiant Christians we may be.

Nevertheless, the text is a fitting one for our study. Had these words been addressed to us in the first instance, they had not been more applicable. Apart from the lighter persecutions to which Christians among us are liable, they suffer in as dire

Digitized by Google

a manner as though in martyrdom. Their sufferings are as truly chastenings as were those of the Hebrew Christians, to whom this epistle was addressed. Nay; these ancient Hebrew Christians, in the teeth of persecutions, suffered less of chastisement therefrom, than some godly parents amongst them, or amongst us, have endured over a son who has gone to the bad, or a daughter walking in the way of sin—suffered less than the high and pure amongst them, or amongst us, have suffered from the promulgation of a foul slander against their fair names. Every Christian of any age suffers chastisement. Hence, these words fit us as though they had been addressed to us in the first instance. It is to be noted, too, that, while the writer of our epistle has particularly in mind sufferings from persecutions, he used universal language. Rather, in appropriating this language from the Proverbs, he apropriated a universal statement; and with it comforted Christians just then receiving a particular form of chastisement; accordingly, we may take *in all its breadth,* this inspired teaching: *"My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord."*

We are here taught that afflictions brought upon the people of God are not to be despised, that is, that they are not to be made light of, or esteemed to be of little account—not to be considered as things to be borne with manly hardihood without reference to God's purpose to usward in them; but that they are to be regarded honestly, according to their nature and degree, and used as a source and means of good. Even persecutions unto blood and death were to be regarded as profitable unto those who bore them for Christ's sake.

Despise not thou the "chastening."

Let us remark the word by which the writer names these afflictions of the people of God. He uses the word *Παιδεία. Παίν* means child. *Παιδεύω* means to rear, train or educate a child. *Παίδεία* is the word for instruction, training, consisting of teaching, admonition, reward and correction by the rod. Our text calls the suffering of the Christians *Παιδεία.* It regards sufferings as a part of the means which God uses to bring his people up to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. The chastening of the Lord is a part of his training of us. The Apostle's exhortation is:

My son, Despise not thou the Lord's chastening as means of

Digitized by Google

training. The reasons why we should not despise the Lord's chastening are of the strongest:

I. *This Chastening springs from God's parental love for his children.*

This is the point which the Apostle makes in the next verse: "For whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." God brings these sufferings on his erring children out of love for "them." He brings them as remedies against the evils with which the child's moral and spiritual nature is affected. He gives them for the moral and spiritual reformation and growth of the child. He is actuated therein by feelings analogous to those of the loving yet wise earthly parent. The earthly parent chastises his child most severely often times out of the deepest and wisest love. He does not punish him as a judge. He chastises his son on occasion of the son's sinning to build up a better character.

The sufferings of Christians, therefore, though they look materially just like the sufferings of those who are not the friends but the enemies of Christ, are to be set as wide apart from them as sun-set is from sun-rise. The intention of God in inflicting them in the two cases is entirely different. In the one case he brings sufferings on the sinner primarily as a punishment for his sin; in the other case, he brings them on out of love to his erring child. The unregenerate stands before God as a criminal before a just and sovereign legislator and judge. The sufferings which he endurs are the penalties of a broken law. God inflicts them, not out love to him, but from love to justice; not to improve in a moral and spiritual way the unregenerate, but to put upon him his iniquity. When the earthly judge pronounces sentence against a criminal, he does not do so, primarily, that the sentence may operate for the renovation of the wayward disposition of the sinner; what he thinks to do is to mete out justice according to the demands of righteous law.

Some hearer may object at this point, that "all men are God's sons; and that he chastens rather than punishes all—treats them all as a father his children, therefore." You may say: "In Acts xvii. 28, we are all said to be the offspring of God. In Malachi xxv. 10, the question is asked: Have we not all one father? And does not our Lord teach the fatherhood of God, as in Matthew vii. 11: How much more shall your Father which

Digitized by Google

is in heaven give good gifts unto them that ask him?" The answer is that the term father is used in the Scriptures in a more general and in a more definite sense. There is predicated of God a fatherhood of man founded on His work of creation and providence. This has been called the providential fatherhood of God. In Mal. ii. 10, the question: "Have we not all one father?" is followed by "Hath not our God created us?" The latter question explains the former. "Creation," as Wm. G. T. Shedd declares, "is a kind of paternity." (p. 419 of Vol. II., Theol.) In Job xvii. 28, 29, this kind of paternity is extended to the inaminate creation. Hence God interrogated Job as follows: "Hath the rain a father? Or who hath begotten the drops of the dew? Out of whose womb came the ice? And the hoary frost of heaven, who hath gendered it?" In Matt. vii. 11. our Lord explains God's fatherhood by his readiness to bestow good things in providence. It is a well-known fact that "this association of paternity with creation and providence is found also in secular literature. Plato says (Timaeus ix.) that 'to discover the creator and father of this universe is indeed difficult.' Horace (Carminum i. 12) speaks of the father of all, who governs the affairs of men and gods.' Creation, together with providence and government, which are necessarily associated with creation, is a solid basis for this kind of paternity." (Shedd: Theol. Vol. II. p. 420.)

This, however, is but an inferior kind of sonship. God, as the universal father, may fill a man's mouth with good things all his days, and yet punish him for his sins; aye, punish him eternally for them. In this sense Dives was the son of God as much as Lazarus or Abraham. He probably thought he was much more God's son than the poor beggar Lazarus that lay at his gate, full of sores and ministered to by the dogs alone. Yet he was punished with sickness, with death and with the torments of the damned in hell.

There is a much higher sort of sonship to God, taught in the Scriptures, than this. It is the sonship of redemption, the sonship of adoption. Paul wrote to the Galatian Christians: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ" (iii. 25); and again, "God sent forth his son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that are under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." (iv. 4, 5). This is that higher

Digitized by Google

and special sonship. It is to such sons, while they yet remain more or less sinful, that God's inflictions are not penalties. It is to such, and to such only, that sufferings are not penal. It is to such only that *sufferings* are chastenings, not the results of judicial wrath, but of parental love. These can not suffer in the way of penalty, because Christ has borne the penalty in the sinner's stead. There is no need of that penalty's being twice borne. Justice does not require it.

No; suffering, to the worlding, is the evidence of God's wrath, intended for the worlding's punishment; but the same sort of suffering upon the true believer still struggling with the remains of sin, is not a punishment, but a chastisement, and evidence of God's love. "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth."

Old John Owen says that we are taught here that God scourgeth especially him whom he receives to be his son in the completest degree, that the more God loves any child of his, the more he scourgeth him. This is, perhaps, reading somewhat into the text.

More legitimate was the view of Dr. B. M. Palmer, who held that he who was without afflictions lacked somewhat of full proof that he was God's child. At one time in his life he is said to have seriously doubted whether he was a child of God. He was so happy in his domestic relations. He was *so happy* in his charge, enjoying vast opportunities of exerting influence and followed by the affectionate and huge admiration of his flock and his community. Things went so well with him that he was disturbed. He wondered whether he was a child of God. But the hand of God began to fall upon him in blows. He lost child after child. Meanwhile he had been driven by war from his pastorate and suffered with the people of his beloved land. Thenceforward, he never doubted, it is said that he was one of God's own. He felt with Eliphaz: "Behold, happy is the man whom God correcteth. Therefore, despise not thou the chastening of the Almighty." "For he maketh sore and bindeth up; he woundeth and his hands make whole."

That we are not to despise the chastening of the Lord, we argue in the second place, from the fact that:

II. *Testimony abounds that afflictions, properly received, are sanctifying in their tendency.*

Digitized by Google

ThePsalmist rejoiees, saying: "Blessed is the man whom thou chasteneth, O Lord, and teachest out of thy law," (xciv. 12, 13). He says, again, "Before I was afflicted I went astray. But now have I kept thy word" (cxix. 67). And again, "It is good for me that I have been afflicted, that I might learn thy statutes" (cxix. 71). Such has been the common experience of the saints of God. They have never really learned God's statutes until affliction has come upon them; and this on several accounts.

They were so taken up with secular matters and so well contented with the returns of secular pursuits, that they cared not to ponder God's will, their relations to him and consequent duties. But on occasion of afflictions the world has lost somewhat of its relative importance, and the things of life eternal have loomed larger in the field of vision. Moreover, afflictions open the *heart* to the understanding of God's Word. A man's comprehension of the Divine Word depends, in part, on the experiences he has had. To the young and ardent the saying: "Vanity of vanity! All is vanity" may seem like the ugliest pessimism. To the man full of years and trials there may appear naught in the saying save the most exact truth. He may feel that every merely worldly pursuit results in emptiness. That God should seem to the Psalmist a "rock in a weary land" may appear hardly intelligible to the youthful worldling, or even to the inexperienced Christian; but he who has been buffeted and worn by chastisements on account of his sins, wearied and tempest-tossed by conflicts external and internal, will have in his own experience that which will expound to him these words of God's servant of old.

Isaiah concurs with the Psalmist in estimating the value of afflictions, saying: "For when thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness. Lord, in trouble, have they visited thee. They poured out a prayer when thy chastening was upon them." (Isa. xxvi. 9, 16). We are taught in Hebrews xii. 11, that affliction, chastisement, yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness. This is a natural result of a better experimental knowledge of God's law which afflictions occasions our acquiring. Chastisement is the purging of the branch by which it is fitted to bring forth fruit. It is the pruning by which excrescences are lopped off. Chastisement helps the true Christian. It can be said of more than King Manasseh: "And

Digitized by Google

when he was in affliction, he besought the Lord his God, and humbled himself greatly before the God of his fathers." And God could say to his people of our day as well as to his "people of old": "Behold, I have refined thee, but not with silver; I have chosen thee in the furnace of affliction."

Some sitting under the sound of my voice may bear little fruit, from lack of pruning. Some may have little understanding of God's Word, from lack of chastisement. Martin Luther once said: "I never knew the meaning of God's word until I was afflicted."

In view of these testimonies as to the value of chastening as a means of sanctification, the exhortation of our text is pertinent: "My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord."

That we are not to despise the Lord's chastening, we argue in the third place, because:

III. *Such means is almost necessary in order to the sanctification of a sinful child of God.*

The old nature still lives in the earth-dwelling child of God. He finds that when he would do good, evil is present with him. The love of the world is not dead, perhaps, in any living Christian. In some Christians, thank God for the fact, the love of the world is not strong. In others it is so strong as to make the observers of their lives doubt as to whether love to God is the controlling principle in those lives or not. Now, the afflictions which come to man through the loss of worldly wealth, are most efficient means of lessening his trust in riches. Perhaps, such a blow, straight at Mammon, who would, if let alone, soon be God's successful rival for the affections of some of his saints, is the necessary means, if God will use means at all, of saving such saints' allegiance to himself. Perhaps, few of God's saints could be freed from an anti-Godward pride of person, of individuality, or of possession, so readily as by a blow affecting the objects in which we take this ungodly pride. Pride is the resident, be it remembered, of bosoms too numerous to be counted. Pride, sometimes, in vulgarity, pride in folly, pride in wickedness, pride in physical strength and agility, pride in supposed personal beauty, pride in mental powers, pride in religiousness, pride in some possession or fact, pride of an unjustifiable sort, about something or other, is found in almost every man. Man is never too high for pride. Man is never too low for pride.

Digitized by Google

Man, Jesus excepted, has never been too good for pride. Who of you compares not yourself with fellows below yourself; and does not, after the fashion of the Pharisee, practically thank God that you are not as other men are? Now, for all this, or for any form of it, what is so fitted to bring us to our senses as a pertinent affliction? The small-pox scars the beautiful complexion. The owner ceases to give to the face the worship which was due to God:

And if, instead of impinging immediately on our own persons, the calamity falls on one of ours, on parents, sisters, brothers, children; you who have had experience, does it not raise your thoughts to God, who has given you the loved one now stricken? Is it not fitted to call the sinner away from his love of the world, and his love of self, as hardly any other instrumentality is? In fact, we see not how an erring child of God would progress into sanctification without the instruction of chastisement.

This method of sanctification could not be employed, indeed, in the case of sinless creatures. Suffering is the consequence of sin. God could not inflict it upon those who had never in any wise merited penalty. It would be unjust. But for such a creature as regenerated man—a being in whom good and bad principles do work up to the hour of death—it seems the only adequate means for the mortification of the principles of evil and the cultivation of the principles of good. It is the plow and hoe of affliction that tear out the weeds from our minds and hearts and allow the good to grow. It is the mattock of chastisement with which the God of all grace uproots the thorns and tares.

Chastisement being such a necessary means of sanctification, the exhortation is certainly in order: "My son, despise not thou the chastisement of the Lord."

That the exhortation of the text should be heeded, we argue, in the fourth place, from the fact that:

IV. Chastisements are *means used by God to prepare his servants for more efficient services.*

When Sir Humphry Davy was a mere boy, his father died and left his estate in disorder and ruin, so that the mother had to become a milliner and the son an apprentice to an apothecary. The boy became serious, and, when his day's work in the shop was over, was found engaged in studies which were the founda-

Digitized by Google

tions of his future greatness as a scientist and discoverer in chemical research. Just so, adversity often makes a Christian, who would otherwise be a weakling, a strong and helpful Christian.

But for the persecutions by the later Stuarts on the English throne, and by Jeffries, and the Bedford Jail, John Bunyan would perhaps never have been able to give the world his immortal allegories. The persecution which shut him in, afflicting as it was, gave him leisure to read, to reflect and to exercise the high qualities, which a more active life would probably never have allowed him to discover and develop.

But for John Milton's *blindness* and *other* afflictions, he, in like manner, never would have been able to write the Paradise Lost; even as another in blindness hath written of himself:

> "Nor think it strange, ye kindly ministers (angels),
> If to these sightless balls, seeking in vain
> The sunlight beam, some slender ray from heaven,
> Unseen before amid the garish light,
> Shall pierce, in mercy sent, or if the soul,
> Left blank of images by sense impressed,
> Shall see by faith and vision spiritual
> The heavenly city and the golden streets,
> Where ye your worship pay."

It was a grievous affliction to Martin Luther to be shut up in the Castle of the Wartburg, after the Diet of Worms. But he had not long been in that confinement, when he was moved to begin the translation of the Scriptures into his masterful and matchless German version. He was thus set agoing on one of the greatest of all his services—indefinitely more important than all the preaching he could have done in the same length of time. For there is no measuring the good to the German people of Luther's version.

Moses was prepared by the long years of afflicting exile, as well as by his early years of prosperity in Egypt, for his great mission as the deliverer of Israel from bondage, and leader through its long wanderings in the wilderness.

Joseph's afflictive treatment by his brethren, who would have killed him, his sale into slavery, the seeming calamity which befell him in the house of Potiphar, his imprisonment, were but a portion of the means used to put him into the position and give

Digitized by Google

him the character needed in that position wherein he could give the noblest service to God and the world.

It is a significant fact, that during the centuries of imperial persecutions, when at times it looked to some as if Christianity would soon be annihilated, the Church was not only not destroyed, but increased with marvelous rapidity. Those persecutions really enabled the Church to do more efficient work as a witness-bearer, so that it came to be said: "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church."

It is significant again, that our own beloved communion manifested a liberality and energy of consecrated effort, after going through our long, bitter and desolating war between the sections, such as her earlier records never showed. Yes, naked, peeled, down-trodden and oppressed, in deep affliction, her poverty abounded unto the riches of liberality.

It thus appears that chastisement often increases power for service in those chastised. It, perhaps, always does this, even though the chatisement end with death.

A rarely endowed rationalist, known widely in all civilized countries, recently passed the portals of death. In the hours of his last illness, calling a few of his friends about his bed, he asked them to pray with him; and when each of them had prayed, he also offered a prayer; and among the sentences of that prayer was this: "And may there be for me a life beyond this life, and in that life may there be works to do, tasks to accomplish." The prayer was thoroughly characteristic of the man. He rioted in work, in accomplishing tasks. But there is a woeful pathos in the prayer: May there be a life for me beyond this life, and in that life may there be work to do. Did this tremendously energetic man doubt that there is a life beyond this life, and a life to be filled with joy-bringing work? There is no room for doubt, there is a life beyond death, and in that life God's servants shall serve him. They shall do works for him. And these chastisements—they are a part of God's means of fitting us for this high service in the provinces of glory.

In representing to us the condition of God's redeemed in the life beyond this life, inspired teachers sometimes represent them as constituting Christ's body, he being the head, they being severally members. They thus teach that the heavenly society is to be perfectly organized, each member of it living, active, working,

Digitized by Google

making his own contribution to the welfare of the whole body. Since the members can not all have the same functions in the service of the whole, they can not but need special fitting each for his work. Must we not think, then, that, in many of our afflictions—peculiar afflictions—God is fitting us for our peculiar work, or works, our life, in the world where God's servants shall everlastingly and gloriously serve him?

Wherefore, shall we not say again, "My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord."

Another reason for heeding the admonition of our text is found in the fact that:

V. *Chastisements occasion the glorification of God.*

They speak to us of an absolute sovereign, on whom we are absolutely dependent. They speak to us of the absolute holiness of that sovereign. They tell us that amongst all the saints of God on earth, not one is sufficiently free from taint to escape suffering. God *will* express his displeasure against all sin. A sainted couple, much honored in our communion, lost four daughters by consumption. As the youngest of these approached the death passage, the parents prayed that the passing might be easy. The child was so sweet, gentle and Christlike in their eyes, that they felt that death to her should be easy. But death sprang upon their darling and *choked* the life out of its victim. She was literally strangled and smothered to death. The agony to the parents was indescribable; but after a little they saw God's holiness in a new light, and sin in a new light, and by consequence salvation in a new light, and grace in a new light. God came very near to them. He became more precious than ever before.

In a thousand other ways, this glorification of God, through the afflictions of his children, might be illustrated. The passage of time forbids our giving other illustrations now. Wherefore, since God is thus glorified, "My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord."

By way of further application, let us remark that, *if chastisements are a blessing, then the manner in which we receive them is of the utmost importance.*

A thing good in itself, or fitted to do us good, may be deprived of much of its power for good, or even turned into a curse by our way of receiving it.

Digitized by Google

(1) Some imagine that all suffering should be borne without wincing, without a sigh, with stoical fortitude. A distinction must be made here: Chastisements are from the hand of God. In some cases they are, at the same time, the immediate results of the enmity, the malice, or at least the inconsiderateness of man. A malignant slanderer perpetrates upon you a calumny. God chastises you. But the wicked calumny is the immediate result of the slanderer's action. Now, you may bear yourself with fortitude unshaken to your back-biter, you should show that you are in no wise to be deterred from the path of duty by him. But you should break up in the presence of God, should acknowledge the ill, the chastisement from his hand at its full and real value. If you underrate it, you can not derive the good from it which it is fitted to bring you.

The Israelites might have stood justly, with all dignity, in the presence of the Babylonish kings, who had carried them into captivity. Those despots had wronged them. They had no right to the people, the princes, the land of Judah, nor to the vessels of their holy house. But when then Israelites thought of their affliction as chastisement from the hand of the Lord, they did well to hang their harps on the willows beside the rivers of Babylon and sing no more. They did right to acknowledge their calamity in all its greatness; for only thus could they recognize the extreme displeasure of the Lord. Persons in affliction are often in danger of leaving God out of them. They treat them as if they were to be charged to chance, mistake or folly, or wholly to the meanness or weakness of ourselves or others. We are to see the hand of God in them, and treat them according to their worth.

(2) My friends, under afflictions, how are you behaving about them? Are you trying to make of them a true *Παιδεία* to you?

Are you trying to make of them an interpreter of God's word to you? Are you trying to make of them a means of growth in grace. Do you, like Hezekiah, turn your face to the wall and cry unto the God who heareth? Do you, like Paul, carry your thorn in the flesh to the Savour? Do you try to learn its uses to you from the Great Teacher It is intended for your instruction. Do you try to profit by it?

(3) Or, have you failed to regard your afflictions as chastisements? Are you like an idle school boy that wastes his oppor-

Digitized by Google

tunities for mental advancement? If so, are you not infinitely more foolish than he? You are trfliing with the blessings of the Lord. To Israel of old, the Lord said, by the mouth of Amos (iv. 12): "Therefore, thus will I do unto thee, O Israel; and because I will do this unto thee, prepare to meet thy God, O Israel," where the implication is that, if thou dost not profit by this chastisement, thou hast cause to fear that at the judgment day thou shalt be found wanting.

(4) Chastisements are grievous to be borne, as the Apostle himself teaches. "All chastening seemeth for the present to be not joyous, but grievous." But so are many nauseous medicines, which we take at a physician's bidding. When the Great Physician of souls comes to his own with these chastisements, shall we not recognize at once our moral sickness and our need of just the curatives offered. The Lord help us so to do.

Digitized by Google

THE PRESBYTERIAN-CUMBERLAND UNION.

By Rev. William R. Henderson D. D., Memphis, Mo.

The union of the Presbyterian and Cumberland Churches was consummated by their respective General Assemblies last May. This important ecclesiastical transaction has therefore passed into history. The doctrinal issues implicated in this proceeding were of such a vital character that Calvinists of every denominational name watched the progress of the negotiations with the profoundest interest. Churches closely akin in doctrine and polity may unite without attracting particular attention, but this was a case of a different character. There was no doctrinal kinship between them. More than a quarter of a century ago a futile attempt was made in the direction of union between these churches. It was not until the revision controversy of seventeen years ago was in progress that there was even a hint that the doctrinal differences separating them might disappear, and the way be opened for union. No effort, so far as was then known, was made in that direction. But when the revision of 1903 was effected, an open and decided movement to unite these churches was undertaken. Prior to the meeting of the Presbyterian Assembly at Los Angeles in 1903, when it was apparent that the revision proposals had carried in the Presbyteries, several Presbyteries sent up overtures asking that steps be taken to unite the Presbyterian and Cumberland Churches, the basis of these overtures being that the revision had prepared the way for such a union. At the same time, similar action was taken by several Cumberland Presbyteries.

A joint committee on union was appointed by the respective Assemblies of these churches in May, 1903. In due time the joint committee met and formulated a plan of union. That which attracted the most attention in this plan was the part which related to the doctrinal position of the two churches. It is set forth in Concurrent Declaration No. 1, and reads as follows:

Digitized by Google

In adopting the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, as revised in 1903, as a basis of union, it is mutually recognized that such agreement now exists between the systems of doctrine contained in the Confessions of Faith of the two churches as to warrant this union.

In the framing of this extraordinary declaration, the Cumberland committee exerted influence of an effective character. The Presbyterian committee, in their report to the Buffalo Assembly (1904) admit that "the language used in the first paragraph of Concurrent Declaration No. 1, declaring that 'such agreement now exists between the systems of doctrine contained in the Confessions of Faith of the two churches'.....was primarily the language of" the Cumberland committee. In their addresses to the Dallas Assembly (1904), some of the members of the Cumberland committee made a fuller statement of facts with regard to the history of this remarkable declaration. Dr. Black, the chairman of the committee, stated that "when the joint committee first met, it was recognized that the crux of the matter lay in three points: Proper recognition of our Confession;" etc. Judge Beard explained to the Assembly how "the word 'now'" came to be inserted in the foregoing "Declaration," "which," he claimed, "practically said that the changes had been made in conformity with our Confession. But our committee was not satisfied till the other committee put the expression 'such agreement' instead of 'sufficient agreement,' thus practically granting all our contention. What more could be wanted?" Certainly; what more could have been wanted by the Cumberland committee? These concessions were of a substantial and significant character. It is not forgotten, that, during the progress of this union movement, it was iterated and re-iterated by its proponents in the Presbyterian Church that "the Cumberland brethren yield everything, we yield nothing; they accept our system of doctrine unequivocally; we make no concession to them doctrinally." And there were a great many Presbyterian ministers and elders who accepted such assurances and supported the union movement. The wife of a venerable Cumberland minister in Missouri epitomized the situation when she said: "I am willing to give up the name 'Cumberland' so long as I do not have to give up my doctrines." The easy-going, conciliatory spirit of the Presbyterian committee seems to have been almost boundless; and, hence, it

Digitized by Google

is not surprising that Dr. Ira Landrith, of the Cumberland committee, should write to his church organ at Nashville that "such men render negotiations like those of last week not only delightfully easy, but a genuine spiritual joy."

The report of the joint committee was made to the respective Assemblies of these churches in 1904.* The submission of the joint report to the Cumberland Assembly was followed by a supplemental report. This report was formulated for the purpose of exhibiting the reasons why they had concurred in the joint report. Taking for its text, "The Revision has Revised," the supplemental report proceeded definitely to point out three fundamental doctrines which it was claimed the revision had eliminated from the Westminster Confession, viz: Unconditional election, definite atonement, and efficacious grace. This report was regarded by the Cumberland Church as a document of the highest importance. The Dallas Assembly, while not formally adopting it, recognized its importance by ordering it to be spread upon its minutes. It appears in the published Minutes, pages 25-30. It exerted a powerful influence in that Assembly and in moulding the sentiment of the Church in favor of union. The official organ of the Church, *The Cumberland Presbyterian,* published it in full, and editorially called the particular attention of ministers and elders to it. "It should be noticed," it said, "that in this supplemental report the committee set forth the grounds for their action, and it is proper that all the people should have access to the facts which influenced the committee. With reference to this supplemental report there are two matters of special interest. It should be remembered that at least three members of the committee, according to their own statement at the Assembly, were, when appointed, opposed to the union movement, yet the report of the committee was unanimous. In

* The joint report to the Buffalo Assembly was dissented from by two members of the Presbyterian Committee, Rev. J. R. Davies, D. D., of Philadelphia, and Mr. Elisha H. Perkins, of Baltimore. They dissented, *inter alia,* "because in our judgment the two churches differ so definitely . . . above all in doctrinal belief, as their doctrinal beliefs are set forth in their respective Confessions of Faith, that union between them would not be justified. And we particularly dissent from the first of the Concurrent Resolutions as confused, misleading, and, at least in one of its interpretations, likely to be placed on its declarations, contrary to facts.—*Assembly Minutes,* 1904, *page* 140.

Digitized by Google

other words, these three members of the committee—and there may have been more—were convinced during their investigation of the subject upon which they were to act, that the union of the two churches would be a wise and good thing. The facts set forth in the supplemental report were the reasons which caused these brethren to change their verdict. We urge our subscribers to read very carefully this supplemental report. The committee studied the whole subject with great care and thoroughness. After equally thorough consideration, the Assembly approved the position and recommendation of its committee." The editor of this paper was a member of the union committee, and was in position to know "whereof he affirmed."

It was in such a light that this supplemental report was regarded in the Cumberland Church—a fact of serious significance in connection with this whole subject. On the contrary, in the Presbyterian Church the friends of union affected to disparage its importance. Its specific presentment of doctrinal points which it claimed had been revised out of the Westminster Confession, was never met by the proponents of union in the Presbyterian Church. It was claimed that "the 'supplemental report' proceeded on the theory that the old Confession was fatalistic, and that fatalism had been revised out of it." An indefinite and evasive answer like this was satisfactory to no one unless his mind was obstinately set upon union, regardless of the doctrinal issues which this supplemental report shows were manifestly involved. Indeed, the course, generally speaking, pursued by the Presbyterian friends of union in ignoring, or practically treating as of little or no consequence, the utterances of the Cumberland union leaders defining their attitude towards the Westminster system of doctrine in terms which evinced their aversion to it, and even the formal and specific presentment of doctrinal matters in the supplemental report, was simply amazing. But it is probably to be explained as due either (1) to doctrinal indifference. Certainly such indifference was exhibited by a prominent member of the Presbyterian union committee when he minimized the importance of the contention as to whether faith preceded or followed regeneration, probably not realizing that this contention touched a fundamental point in the Westminster system of doctrine. Or, (2), that in view of the alleged "agreement between the systems of doctrine" in the two

Digitized by Google

Confessions, all these things were regarded as not inconsistent with the spirit and purpose of the union movement.

The fact that the doctrinal position of the Cumberland committee, as set forth in the supplemental report, was brought to the knowledge of the Buffalo Assembly, should have served to put that body upon inquiry. But an Assembly which listened with impatience to the masterly argumentation of Drs. Patton and Minton against the plan of union, and applauded to the echo every utterance of the union advocates, was in no mood to pause and consider whither its course was tending. It is true, that a resolution was passed, known as the "Moffatt rider," which was generally understood, though not so stated, to be in response to the supplemental report, declaring that the system of doctrine contained in the Confession had not been impaired by the revision. But this declaration was ambiguous, for the reason that this same phrase, *system of doctrine,* is used in Concurrent Declaration No. 1. In the latter it is affirmed that the Westminster system of doctrine is in agreement with the Cumberland system of doctrine. A resolution answerable to the situation would have definitely met the specific issues raised in the supplemental report. This ambiguity was so manifest, that Dr. Ira Landrith, of the Cumberland committee, who was in Buffalo at the time, interpreted the "Moffatt rider" as meaning that revision had not "impaired any of the Biblical truths which the Westminster Confession contained." The phrase, *system of doctrine,* has as Dr. Charles Hodge declared, "a fixed, historical meaning," and covers those doctrines in particular which differentiate Calvinism from Arminianism, known as the "Five Points." Dr. Hodge expresses the view which has generally prevailed, when he says:

> We do not expect that our ministers should adopt every proposition contained in our Standards. This they are not required to do. But they are required to adopt the system; and that system consists of certain doctrines, no one of which can be omitted without destroying its identity.

He contends that any man who denies the Confessional doctrine of original sin "thereby rejects the system taught in our Confession and cannot, with a good conscience, say that he adopts it." Similarly, he argues with regard to the doctrines of inability, unconditional election, etc., every one of which, he says,

Digitized by Google

is vital to the system of doctrine contained in the Confession. It is obvious, then, that this phrase is one of commanding importance. In view of the Assembly's adoption of Concurrent Declaration No. 1, it is important to know in what sense this phrase, as used in the "Moffatt rider," is to be understood. If the historic sense was meant—in the sense of covering the "Five Points" of Calvinism—was this phrase used in a similar sense in Concurrent Declaration No. 1?

The question in what sense this phrase was used by the Buffalo Assembly in the foregoing action, becomes still more important because of certain declarations of the Presbyterian and Cumberland Assemblies last May. The latter Assembly said that in consummating this union "on the doctrinal basis of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, as revised in 1903, the Cumberland Presbyterian Church does not surrender anything integral in its own system of doctrine as set out in its own Confession of Faith, nor has the Presbyterian Church asked or expected us to do so." The Presbyterian Assembly declared "that ministers, ruling elders and deacons, in expressing approval of the Westminster Confession of Faith, as revised in 1903, are required to assent only to the system of doctrine contained therein, and not to every particular statement in it; and inasmuch as the two Assemblies meeting in 1904 did declare that there was then a sufficient agreement between the systems of doctrine contained in the Confessions of the two churches to warrant the union of the churches, therefore the change of doctrinal standards resulting from the union involves no change of belief on the part of any who were ministers, ruling elders or deacons in the Cumberland Presbyterian Church." In the foregoing action of these Assemblies this phrase, system of doctrine, repeatedly occurs. It occurs in connection with subject-matter which manifestly precludes its historic sense. It goes without saying that it was not used in this historic sense in the above declaration of the Cumberland Assembly—yet Concurrent Declaration No. 1 declares the two systems of doctrine to be in agreement. And in view of the connection in which it stands in the declaration of the Presbyterian Assembly, this sense was certainly not intended. Important testimony as to the meaning of this phrase in these union transactions was borne by Dr. S. M. Templeton, of the Cumberland committee, in his speech to the Dallas Assembly, when he said:

Digitized by Google

The revisionists of the Presbyterian Church believe with us to-day that the integrity of their great system is not impaired; our fathers did not believe it impaired, but strengthened, by excepting to the doctrine of fatality. And they have opened a door wide enough to drive our whole Cumberland Presbyterian system through. Their "revision" is not intended to state the meaning of the Westminster Confession; it is intended to express the present mind of the Church . . . It cuts in sunder the doctrines of unconditional predestination, of limited atonement, etc.

The view thus expressed by Dr. Templeton was embodied in the supplemental report. It stands, then, as the expression not only of an individual minister, but of the important committee of which he was a member; and this position, elaborately set forth in the supplemental report, was, according to the official organ of the Cumberland Church, approved by the Dallas Assembly "after thorough consideration." In view, therefore, of the pronounced doctrinal position of the Cumberland committee, it goes without saying that in practically drafting Concurrent Declaration No. 1, the words, system of doctrine, were not used in their historic sense—as embodying the distinguishing Calvinistic doctrines of unconditional election, definite atonement, efficacious grace, total depravity, and the perseverance of the saints. Had a positive, determined stand been taken at this stage of the negotiations by the Presbyterian committee—had the Cumberland committee been given to understand in unmistakable terms that the Presbyterian Church had not, by reason of the revision, modified her doctrinal position in the least—*that she stood firmly and unflinchingly by these great doctrines*—it is not a reasonable supposition that the negotiations would have been continued by the Cumberland Church. Dr. Roberts has stated that the "Cumberland men were given to understand that our doctrinal system was not impaired in the least by the revision of 1903." Nevertheless, the Cumberland draft of Concurrent Declaration No. 1 was accepted by the Presbyterian committee, and thereby "the whole case was given away." Hence, when the Presbyterian Assembly of 1906 said that "the change of doctrinal standards resulting from the union involves no change of belief on the part of" the Cumberland Church, it based this official utterance upon Concurrent Declaration No. 1, which declared "such agreement between the systems of doctrine" of the two Confessions as to warrant the union. These facts, therefore,

Digitized by Google

plainly evince that the content of this phrase, system of doctrine, is materially variant from "the fixed, historical meaning" which has always attached to it in Calvinistic circles. And if it was used in the "Moffatt rider" in its well-known historic sense—it being used there in direct connection with the union negotiations—the result will be the introduction of "confusion worse confounded" into the counsels of the united Church. For terms and phrases must be employed in a sense clearly understood by all parties in ecclesiastical as well as civil contracts, or trouble is bound to ensue.

Historically speaking, the systems of doctrine of the two Confessions have always been regarded as utterly divergent and antagonistic. The Cumberland Confession traverses the doctrines which, from time immemorial, have been deemed essential to the integrity of the Calvinistic system. Unconditional election, for instance, has always been regarded as the distinguishing tenet, the *raison d'etre,* of Calvinism. Principal Cunningham says that "the only conclusive proof that a man is not an Arminian, is the proof that he holds this fundamental principle of Calvinism." If one goes astray upon this foundation doctrine, he will necessarily find himself astray with regard to the other doctrines which form integral parts of the Calvinistic system. Of this truth we have an illustration in the Cumberland Confession. The object of its framers was to eliminate Calvinism from their Confessional theology. That they succeeded in so doing has never been questioned until recently. It has indeed become the fashion of late—perhaps prompted by the exigencies of the union movement—to characterize the Cumberland Confession as embodying a form of Calvinism. During the progress of the union negotiations, certain passages of this Confession were cited by union advocates in the Presbyterian Church in support of their claim that that Confession was, at least to some extent, Calvinistic. But this contention overlooked the real question in issue, to-wit: Is the Cumberland *system of doctrine* Calvinistic? Sporadic indications of Calvinism do not prove the doctrinal system to be Calvinistic. In his book entitled, "Doctrines and Genius of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church," Rev. Dr. A. B. Miller, the late president of the Cumberland College at Waynesburg, Pa., says:

Digitized by Google

Nothing that can be said negatively of the doctrinal system of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church is more true or more characteristic of it than that it is *un*-Calvinistic. (The italics are the author's.) I am well aware that it is not uncommon with our people, some ministers included, to speak of our theology as "mild form of Calvinism," "the Calvinistic system slightly modified," "Calvinism with the sterner features omitted," etc. With my views of the two doctrinal systems, I can only say that those who speak in such phraseology as the foregoing either have not carefully compared the two systems, or are very careless in the use of language which the facts of the case will not at all justify.

Thus spoke a man who ranked among the foremost thinkers of his church, and whose book was published in response to the request of the Board of Publication of the Cumberland Church. On page 94, he says again:

The Confession of Faith of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, as adopted in 1829, and still more fully as revised in 1883, is in irreconcilable antagonism to the obvious and historic sense of the Westminster Confession.

But the Presbyterian promoters of union seem to have been of a different opinion, and they did not hesitate to proclaim the Calvinism of the Cumberland Confession. Dr. W. H. Roberts, the chairman of the Presbyterian union committee, was reported in the *Buffalo Express* of May 27, 1904, as having said to the Assembly:

Dr. Roberts said that he was a high Calvinist. He stood for certain positions of the strictest kind, but there are different types of Calvinism that have a right of existence in the Presbyterian Church of America. It is left to this Assembly to say whether the Cumberland Church is Calvinistic enough to unite with us.

Dr. Roberts' Calvinism will not be impeached by any one who knows him. He is above the average in Calvinistic culture, and doubtless for this reason his remarks had great weight with many in the Buffalo Assembly. It is, therefore, a puzzle when or by what process he came to recognize the Cumberland Confession as embodying any form of Calvinism, for in a carefully prepared paper, which he read in 1889, before the Presbyterian Ministers' Association of Cincinnati, Ohio, and which was afterwards published in a series of three articles in the *Herald and Presbyter*, Dr. Roberts said:

Digitized by Google

It is with regret that I feel compelled to state that I regard certain of the proposed changes in Chapter III., when conjoined with objections to the doctrines of preterition and reprobation, as indicating on the part of the proposers, a lack of sympathy with the Calvinistic system of doctrine. Our Confession of Faith is not only a definite and complete, but also a logical and systematic presentation of Scripture truth. The system finds its center in the divine sovereignty, and is expressed in part in the doctrine of the divine decrees as contained in Chapter III. To the integrity of this system the doctrine of preterition is quite as essential as that of predestination. Predestination necessitates preterition; you cannot choose the first of two persons without passing by the second. Both doctrines stand or fall together. Strike the one out of the Confession, and the other must, sooner or later, be also stricken out. Enter into lengthy argument at this point I cannot, for the limits of space forbid. It is sufficient that a source of danger be pointed out, by recalling the history of a movement for the revision of Chapter III., which began in a neighboring Synod at the commencement of this century. Of present decided interest and value is it to remember that the Cumberland Presbyterians, when they amended the Westminster Confession in 1829, modified sections 1 and 2 of Chapter III., and eliminated the remaining six. It is likewise a curious repetition of history, to find that they substituted in Chapter X. section 3, instead of the word "elect," the word "all," before "infants." Presbyterians in government the Cumberlanders are, *but Calvinists in doctrine they are not.* The beginning of their departure toward semi-Arminianism was a demand for the modification of Chapter III., especially as regards the doctrine of preterition, and it is now seriously proposed by some persons in our midst favoring Confessional revision, to amend the same chapter, to some extent in the very way in which it was amended by a now *distinctly Arminian body. Cumberland revision led inevitably to Arminianism.* And in the light of past history, objectors to Chapter III., and to its essential doctrine of reprobation, have the burden of proof thrown upon them to show that its revision by us, through the elimination of certain of its sections, will not result in an attempt to make our church a church which shall be *"Presbyterian without being Calvinistic."*

The *Herald and Presbyter,* in its issue of August 28, 1889, in reviewing Dr. Roberts' articles, said: "Dr. Roberts finds a warning in the revision of the Cumberland Church. This is a mistake. The Cumberlands went astray for years, abandoning Calvinism and the Confession, and then they made their Confession. Revision, as we favor it, is from a different standpoint." The church which Dr. Roberts characterized as a "distinctly Arminian body"—which he held up to revisionists as an "awful example"—and which the *Herald and Presbyter* charged with having "abandoned Calvinism"—had identically the same Con-

Digitized by Google

fession in 1904 that it had in 1889. If it was an Arminian Confession in 1889—if it was the symbol of a church which had "abandoned Calvinism"—when or in what manner was it transformed into a Calvinistic Confession?

It has been a question in the minds of many how a common basis of doctrinal argument could be found by two hitherto antagonistic churches. It is universally conceded that, up to 1903, no one would have asserted any doctrinal agreement between the two Confessions. But recent events have made plain the fact that the revision provided the basis for the union of these churches. The question then arises, Did the revision of 1903 modify the doctrinal system of the Westminster Confession? The limits of this article will not permit a full discussion of this question. In brief, the revision created a complex situation. On the one hand, the position can be maintained, as it has been ably maintained, that the Westminster system of doctrine was not impaired by the revision. On the other hand, the revision material affords ground for the opposite contention. It is certainly an anomalous, and, as the history of the American Presbyterian Church has shown in the last hundred years, a perilous situation. The difficulty chiefly arises out of the use in the revision material of passages of Scripture whose meaning has long been in debate between Calvinists and Arminians. The statement of a creed in Scripture language has never been regarded as a wise course to pursue. None of the great creeds is clothed in Scripture language, for the reason that their purpose was to set forth with definiteness and precision what is "expressly set down in Scripture," and also what, "by good and necessary consequence, may be deduced from Scripture." Principal Cunningham* tells us that early in the eighteenth century there were those in the English Presbyterian Church, who, having "abandoned the generally received doctrine of the Trinity, professed at first to object only to the unscriptural terms in which the doctrine was usually embodied; declaimed about freedom of thought and ecclesiastical tyranny, and denounced all Scripture consequences as unwarrantable and precarious, while they were, of course, quite willing to subscribe to the *ipsissima verba* of Scripture." And referring to the discus-

* The Reformers and Theology of the Reformation, pps. 526-7.

Digitized by Google

sions of his own time, he says the practice was common "of explaining away the true doctrine of the atonement, by concealing it in vague and indefinite language, under the pretence of repudiating Scripture consequences and adhering to the *ipsissima verba* of revelation." Since the first revision controversy began, we have heard a great deal of protest, especially against forms of statement in Chapter 3; the doctrine of reprobation has been the chief point of attack; the Confession has been declared to contain only "the Gospel for the elect," and that it is silent about "the infinite love of God for all men;" etc. So when the revision was finally formulated, Scripture passages were employed for creedal purposes, especially in the Declaratory Statement, resulting in an utter lack of precise and definite creedal expression. This, as an another has pertinently said, is "the vice of the revision. It introduces into the exact statements of the Confession some of those general utterances of God's Word which the Arminian, in accordance with his own *a priori* conceptions, has always interpreted in one way, and the Calvinist, in accordance with the general tenor of God's Word and all the facts, has always interpreted in another way. For example, the revision says: 'The doctrine of God's eternal decree is held in harmony with the doctrine of his love for all mankind, his gift of his son to be the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, ... with the doctrine that God desires not the death of any sinner.' Of course; but the question arises, Are these Scriptural phrases to be taken in the Arminian or the Calvinistic sense?"* This is a question of interpretation which the revision leaves unanswered.

The revision resembles in this respect the Dingley Tarriff law, certain provisions of which were so framed as to leave the way open for the negotiation of reciprocity treaties.

The Cumberland Church was quick to recognize the fact that a doctrinal construction of the revision in keeping with her Confessional theology was fully warranted. Hence, the supplemental report significantly says: "The phrase, 'as revised in 1903,' is one of the significant marks of the (joint) report." The members of the Cumberland committee felt that there was substantive value to their church in the revision, and they seem to have been determined to get the full benefit of it. According to

* "Does Revision Revise?" by Dr. E. C. Gordon, in *Christian Observer*, July 20, 1904.

Digitized by Google

Judge Beard, the Presbyterian committee was asked at the outset of the negotiations to make such a statement "as would admit that they had revised their Confession." And it seems the Presbyterian committee responded to this request with admissions covering the results of the revision that were entirely satisfactory to the other committee. For Judge Settle, a man of keen legal discernment, for he is one of the judges of the Court of Appeals of Kentucky, said in addressing the Dallas Assembly:

> But I can tell you that all the members of that committee which met in St. Louis recognized and admitted that there had been a revision to the extent stated in the Concurrent Declaration.

Moreover, Dr. Mitchell said to the same Assembly:

> The four points on which our fathers dissented constituted a revision —on the outside. Has the Presbyterian revision which has proceeded on the inside covered these points in a way to satisfy us? I need not turn to the chapters and sentences which prove it and which declare that there are no eternal reprobates, that Christ died in the same sense for all men, that no man is condemned save on the ground of his own sin, and that infants dying in infancy are saved . . . The four points of dissent have been wiped out.

Dr. S. M. Templeton also said in his speech at Dallas:

> The revision does not seem to take up much room in the book, but what it does to the Westminster Confession is a plenty. . . It will come to be recognized in the united church of the future that the doctrine of that church is contained in the revision, and that the high Calvinist is allowed in that church only on sufferance. . . Some say, "they have not revised, because the third chapter is still there." . . . These are taking the back track—they are not traveling the way the Northern Church is going. Its back is turned to the Third Chapter. That chapter remains in print, but it is a dead letter.

This is certainly a startling statement; but is it any more startling than the utterances of some of the liberal revisionists in past years? According to the declarations of these Cumberland brethren, the admissions that were made by the Presbyterian committee were of a substantial character. The members of the Cumberland committee were among the strongest and most sagacious men of that church; they understood their Confessional theology, and they were loyally and uncompromisingly devoted to it. When these union negotiations were inaugurated, they determined to utilize every advantage that, in a doctrinal way,

Digitized by Google

would be to the benefit of their church. They determined to secure "proper recognition of their Confession," and they succeeded. They determined to secure such admissions from the Presbyterian committee as would show, as Dr. Mitchell put it, that "the four points of dissent had been wiped out," and these men state that they were satisfied upon this point. Their statements have never been challenged.

It is obviously no answer to all this to say that the position these men took—and which was formally and deliberately presented in the supplemental report—simply meant that the Presbyterian Church had disclaimed fatalism. Such an answer is both superficial and evasive. According to Cumberland conception, fatalism inheres in—essentially belongs to—especially the doctrines of unconditional election and efficacious grace. And when they say that fatalism has been disclaimed by the Presbyterian Church, they mean that these doctrines have been repudiated. History shows that Cumberland revision—which Dr. Roberts says "led straight to Arminianism"—expunged these offensive doctrines, and thus they claim they got rid of fatalism. And all this they have persistently and openly asserted, officially and otherwise, has been accomplished by the revision of 1903. Hence, according to Cumberland contention, the Presbyterian Church has abandoned her historic doctrinal position, and now stands upon the doctrinal platform, upon which the Cumberland Church has stood for nearly a century. In this contention the Cumberland Presbyterians are supported by Dr. Roberts, for, as he declared the Cumberland Church to be a "distinctly Arminian body," it follows that if the doctrinal systems of the two Confessions—the Cumberland Confession having undergone no change—are in agreement, his conclusion that a church holding such a doctrinal position would be "Presbyterian without being Calvinistic," is certainly warranted—upon the basis of his reasoning—in the case of the united church. This union, then, is more than the mere coalition of two churches; it goes deeper than union upon the principle of comprehension; it is significant of the interpretation which the Presbyterian Church now places upon the revision of 1903. Thus, in this circuitous manner, the liberal revisionists have finally accomplished what Dr. Patton has justly characterized as an "indirect revision of the Confession along radical lines."

Digitized by Google

In view of all these facts, it need excite no surprise that when the union committee was appointed by the Los Angeles Assembly in 1903, not a step was taken in the direction of union negotiations with the Southern Presbyterian Church. The preamble to the resolution authorizing the appointment of a committee on union contemplated "consolidation among Churches of the Reformed Faith, which are most nearly akin in doctrine and organization." The Southern Presbyterian Church certainly answered this requirement. Had there been any desire to open such negotiations with that church, the resolution removing all aspersions could have been introduced then as well as a year later, for there was no more amiable feeling towards the Southern Church in 1904 than there was in 1903. In view of all that has occurred since, it evidently did not suit the purpose of those who were directing this movement to undertake, at that time, to open negotiations with the Southern Church. Had such a step been taken and the union effected, a serious obstacle might have been interposed to a union with the Cumberland Church. According to Dr. Briggs,* there has long been a disposition upon the part of the class, whom he styles the "milder Calvinists," to unite with the Cumberland Church—a church which he characterizes as holding to "the semi-Arminianism of the milder type of Calvinism"—while "there is a natural tendency of the sterner Calvinists to affiliate with" the Southern Church. The former class comprise the radical revisionists of the past seventeen years—the men who, when the first revision movement was in progress, strenuously denounced the very doctrines of the Confession, against which the Cumberland Church had stood in solid and hostile array for nearly one hundred years. As this class has finally accomplished its purpose of bringing the Presbyterian Church into doctrinal affinity with the Cumberland Church, it has succeeded at last in enthroning in the Confession a doctrinal interpretation diametrically opposite to the historic faith of the church, and subversive of the system of doctrine which has been the peculiar crown and glory of the Presbyterian Church.

* "Whither," page 242.

Digitized by Google

PRAYING THE LORD OF THE HARVEST.—Matt. ix. 38.*

By Rev. R. C. Reed, D. D.

Professor in Columbia Theological Seminary,

South Carolina.

"Pray ye therefore," *i. e.* because "the harvest is great and the laborers are few." Shall we do violence to this language if we stretch it around the world? I think not. While Jesus may have pointed the attention of his disciples merely to the multitudes immediately before them; or at most, have suggested to their minds only the multitudes of Galilee and Judea, their own fellow countrymen; yet we know that the mind and heart of Jesus, his desires and designs—his grace and compassion—were not bounded by any such narrow limits. With him the "field" was always, and is always the world. There is not a spot on the face of the earth where men dwell that is not swept by the vision of Christ and included as a part of the great harvest field.

Giving this broad meaning to his words, how signally true, how sadly, tragically true it is that the "harvest is plenteous and the laborers are few!" The largest part of this field is entirely destitute of laborers. Hnndreds of millions of our fellow-sinners never saw and never heard a preacher of the gospel. In other vast heathen populations there are here and there little groups of missionaries, merely enough to emphasize the need. As our Saviour sees the multitudes in all these lands, the crowded millions of China and India, the degraded myriads of Africa and the Islands of the Sea, the no less needy and vicious populations of our own great cities, he is moved with compassion on them. Blessed be his name, he has not turned his face away from the world that could not endure his presence, that could not suffer him to grow old, as "he went about doing good," but hurried him to a felon's doom in the prime of his early manhood. He

*Address delivered before the Society of Missionary Inquiry in Union Seminary, May 6, 1906.

Digitized by Google

cherishes no resentment. He is moved with compassion as he looks upon them—not at their poverty, their physical discomfort, not at their many ills to which flesh is heir, but because they are as sheep, distressed and scattered, needing care and guidance, without a shepherd. Jesus pities the innumerable multitudes of all lands that are stumbling on in spiritual darkness down to hopeless graves, who have no one to show them the way of life, and to help them to find a safe refuge before the night comes on. He pities them because they have no preachers. He would have the world filled with preachers. This was one of the last things that filled his mind before he went back to the Father. He desired that there should be some one to preach the gospel to every creature.

In view of this sad state of things, what does Jesus command his disciples to do?

I. *"Pray ye, &c."* Is this all? Does he lay no other duty on us except to pray? This is all. He says to us, "Turn to God, the Lord of the harvest, and ask him to send forth laborers, and he will do it." How many? As many as are needed. It has been estimated that it would require an additional army of 40,000 missionaries to break to the destitute heathen the bread of life, so that every one might have a little. If we ask God, will he give us that many? Yes, why not? He can do it. "All souls are mine," he says, and he can dispose of them as he will. He can "make them willing in the day of his power." Forty thousand can easily be spared from the ranks of evangelical Christendom, and these, the strongest and the best. O, but it would take $40,000,000 to send them out and support them. Well, what of that? Little Christian England sent out 230,000 men to South Africa, and supported them at a cost of $240,000,000. There are in the Protestant churches of Great Britain and America about 25,000,000. If these would average only one cent per day, there would be money enough to support all our present missionary work, and far more than 40,000 additional missionaries. It would be no great miracle, would it, for God to enable Christians to give on an average of one cent a day to make Christ known to the world?

There is nothing impracticable, then, in this plan proposed by our Saviour to meet the spiritual needs of the multitudes. Without anything approaching to a miracle, God could summon from

Digitized by Google

the hosts of Protestant Christendom enough laborers to supply the field, and secure money enough to support them. The dying words of Simeon Calhoun were well-matured words: "It is of deep conviction, and I say it again and again, that if the Church of Christ were what she ought to be, twenty years would not pass away till the story of the cross would be uttered in the ears of every living man." *"Pray ye."* That is all. Christ expected us to fill the world with missionary laborers by simply praying to the Lord of the harvest. But Christendom has been tugging away at this gigantic task for years and years, for centuries and centuries, and do we understand that it can be done in this easy way? Perhaps it is not so easy, but this is Christ's command. He bids us ask the Father, and the promise is wrapped up in the command. "Ask and ye shall receive."

II. Have we not been praying? Some five years ago, our General Assembly, alarmed at the declining number of candidates for the ministry, called the Church to prayer. The call has been renewed from time to time. I have been watching for the answer. I have not seen it yet. Elijah did not have to wait five years before seeing the evidence that his prayer had reached the ear of God. Does it not seem that by this time the Church should be seeing the cloud? But it has not made its appearance. I think I am correct in saying that, in proportion to number of communicants, we have never had fewer laborers than we have to-day! Have we proved that the Saviour's plan is ineffective? May it not be that there has been no answer because there has been no prayer? It is one thing to say prayers; it is quite another thing to pray. The twelve disciples learned this. They had been saying prayers since early childhood. But they had not been long with Jesus until it was painfully borne in on them not only that they had not been praying, but that they did not know how to pray. They saw plainly that prayer did not mean for them what it meant for him. They were not getting from it the uplift, the joy and the power that he found in it. Unquestionably he regarded prayer as a Christian's supreme resource. It was the source of strength and of guiding influence to his own marvelous activities. More than twelve legions of angels always waited on his prayers. He commends it as of equal value to his disciples. "Whatsoever ye ask in my name, I will do it." "Put faith as a grain of mustard seed into your prayer, and it will hurl

Digitized by Google

the mountain from its base.". Have we been praying the Lord of the harvest? I very much doubt it. What we have been doing, perhaps, demonstrates that we do not know how to pray. God was never closer to the world than he is to-day; his heart never more tender; his power to answer prayer never greater.

III. What, then, is prayer? It "is the offering up of our desires unto God, for things agreeable to his will." We have had a part of it—we have been asking for things agreeable to his will. But what about the desire? Where there is no desire, there is no prayer. Where there is no strong desire, there is no guarantee of an answer. It is the "effectual, fervent prayer" that availeth much. "Ye shall seek me and find me, &c." Prevailing prayer is the earnest cry of the heart for what it really wants. The lips can not pray. They can recite words. They can repeat beautiful formulas of devotion. But they cannot pray. The heart, the heart, the heart, alone, can pray! David felt this when he said: "Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it." O if worship were merely some outward thing, how easy to offer it. But "the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, a broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." Alas, how often our lips are repeating a lesson which they have learned, while our hearts, our wayward, wicked hearts, are wandering like the fool's eyes, to the uttermost parts of the earth.

In his little book, Daniel Quorm and His Religious Reflections, Mark Guy Pierce gives us a suggestive hint on this subject. In passing through the country, Daniel stops over night with an old friend whom he had not seen for years. Next morning his friend holds family worship. He prays among other things that the heavenly Father would give them the Holy Spirit to enable them to be patient and gentle, and loving, and Christlike in their lives. Daniel thought: "What a good man, what an earnest Christian my friend has come to be." About 12 o'clock he went out to where his friend was at work on his farm. He found him fussing and fuming and all out of sorts. When he came in to dinner, he was quarrelling because dinner was late. By and by he said: "Daniel, the servants are so trifling these days that it is enough to wear a man's life out to deal with them." Whereupon Daniel said to him: "My friend, you are disappointed, are you not?" "No, I don't know as I am; what do you mean?" "You failed to get that gift you were expecting." "What gift,

Digitized by Google

Daniel, I was not expecting any gift; whatever do you mean?" "O, you were not expecting any gift. I heard you ask your heavenly Father for one, and I thought perhaps you were expecting it, and had been disappointed." "O, that is what you are talking about, is it?" "Yes, that is what I am talking about. It is evident you did not expect an answer to your prayer; and if God had answered it, and given you the patience and gentleness of Christ, your family would have thought you were ailing, and would have sent for the doctor." Do we ever pray like Daniel's friend?

"Out of the heart are the issues of life." Out of the heart issue all prayers that are worthy the name of prayers. Thus our life and our prayers have the same source. Is our heart crying out for something? Then our life is reaching out for the same thing. The heart never goes one way and the life another. As is the heart, so is the life, and as is the life, so is the prayer.

IV. What is the proof of prayer? An effort to obtain that for which we have prayed. Suppose a boy looks over into a farmer's orchard and sees some beautiful red apples that make an almost irresistible appeal to his appetite. He says: "I must have some of those apples." He goes to the house of the farmer and politely asks for them. The farmer says: "My boy, just go and help yourself." Does the boy regard his prayer as answered? Or does he turn away and say: "The stingy, old fellow would not give me a single apple?" Look at his flying feet as he hastens to the coveted fruit. The Church looks across the seas at the lands lying in darkness, and then goes down on her knees and prays the Lord to send forth laborers. The Lord says: "The way is open, help yourself." What does the Church do? Gets up and says: "The Lord is deaf to our prayer." The trouble is, that none of us are willing to go, and we are praying the Lord of the harvest to send somebody else.

I doubt whether any disciple of Christ can offer this prayer unless he have that measure of the missionary spirit that would make him willing, if eligible, to answer his own prayer. When Isaiah saw the vision and heard the voice saying: "Whom shall I send and who will go for us?" what did he do? One thing he didn't do; he did not say, "well, I don't know who will go. Somebody ought, and I will pray about it, and see if anybody will offer." "Behold me," he said, "send me." How did he know he

Digitized by Google

would fill the bill? He did not know it. He had not been asked to go. He only heard the voice asking for some one to go somewhere and to do something. He knew not who, nor where, nor what. He only knew that wherever or whatever, he was ready for it, if the Lord thought he was the man. That is the spirit of consecration demanded of one who is to pray this prayer. It appears that the very next morning after Jesus laid this command on his disciples, twelve of them were commissioned and went forth to answer their own prayer. A little later on he appointed seventy others, and immediately on their appointment, he puts this prayer into their lips. They could offer it sincerely and earnestly for they had surrendered their own hearts to the Lord's service. Every true missionary can offer this prayer.

Listen to this testimony of Hudson Taylor. He and about a dozen other men gathered together to spend eight days in waiting on God—four alternate days being days of fasting as well as prayer. "When we gathered together, we were led to pray for one hundred missionaries to be sent out by our English Board in the year 1887, from January to December. And further than this, our income had not been elastic for some years—it had been about £22,000, and we were led in connection with that Forward Movement to ask God for £10,000 in addition to the income of the previous year. What was the result? God sent out offers of service from over 600 men and women during the following year, and those who were deemed to be ready and suitable were accepted, and were sent out to China; and it proved to be exactly one hundred. What about the income? God did not give us exactly the £10,000 we asked for, but he gave us £11,000." Is there anything wonderful about this? Nothing. They were offering up the desires of their hearts for things agreeable to the will of God, and it would have been wonderful if he had not heard them.

If only we could get this prayer into the heart and life of the Church, there would be no difficulty about men and money. Every eligible man would be an available man. This is true in the Moravian Church, and the result is that they have one missionary for every fifty-eight members, and two communicants on the foreign field for every one at home.

V. The prayer that gets the men will get the money. The Church will never really pray for more men than she is willing to

Digitized by Google

support. We know, when we pray for them that their support is to come out of our pockets. Consequently a prayer for enlarged expenses contains a promise to give more money. A few days ago, the Mayor of San Francisco telegraphed the Mayor of Chicago: "Send us carpenters." Not a word about the expense of sending them, nor their pay when they reached their destination. The request carried all this with it. When we send a prayer to God for more laborers, the prayer creates an obligation to send out and support as many as the Lord sees fit to furnish.

Here, again, let us apply the test and see whether we have been really praying the Lord of the harvest. During the greater part of the time since the Assembly first issued its call to prayer, we have been giving on an average of 82 cents per annum per member, to send men to the foreign field. This gave a very meagre support to the force already dependent on us. How many additional men did we expect the Lord to give us for the harvest field? As indicated by the total lack of provision for the support of additional laborers we did not expect the Lord to send one.

Brethren, I would not criticise harshly, or rashly the Church of Christ, but, weighing well my words, I say that the Church has not been praying the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers into his harvest. Our own Southern Presbyterian Church has not responded to the call of the General Assembly. Why? Simply because its heart is not in the work of world-wide evangelization. Each particular congregation thinks if it has the money it can hire some one to minister to its own needs, and that is about as far as its interest extends. Individuals here and there are interested in giving the gospel to the world. I am thankful to believe the number is rapidly increasing, and their interest is deepening. But the Church at large, the rank and file, care nothing for missions. In thousands of congregations no collection is taken. In other thousands, the collection is a sad revelation of utter apathy. It is made up for the most part of nickles and dimes, the same kind of coin that we throw to beggars, to the organ grinder and his monkey, to get rid of them. It shows that missions and beggars are held in the same esteem. Think of 82 cents per member. "The effectual, fervent prayer of the righteous availeth much," but 82 cents are not much. If

Digitized by Google

we wasted no more than 82 cents in twelve months, would we not be regarded as models of economy? O, if it could be shown we had not spent on peanuts and pop-corn and soda-water more than 82 cents in the course of a whole twelve months, we would be regarded as prodigies of parsimony! O, if the cause of world-wide evangelization could only come in for the waste of the Church, it would make a grand stride forward. And can it be said that the Church is interested in missions when it withholds from that cause even the leakage, the waste, the superfluity of self-indulgence? Alexander Duff said that the Church in his day was "merely playing at missions." This may seem little praise, but it is more than the Church deserves. If the Church were even playing at missions it would take an interest in its play.

Why am I stressing this? What good can it do to dwell on the dereliction of the Church? What comfort can we extract from it? My object is to make this the basis of an appeal to my brethren in the ministry. Are you called to the ministry? Then you are called to the work of the foreign field—every last one of you. There isn't any doubt of that. You may settle down in some little county or village pastorate, but don't suppose that is your field—that is a very small part of it. The whole world is your field, and if you close your eyes to any part of it, you will not be faithful to your Master. The same is true of the Church which you may serve. On it rests the obligation to do what it can to give the gospel to the world. It is your duty to teach the members this obligation. If you can't do this, if you can't get them to recognize their responsibility in this matter, you have missed your calling.

"To the pastor," says Dr. George F. Pentecost, "belongs the privilege and responsibility of solving the missionary problem. Until the pastors of our churches wake to the truth of this proposition, and the foreign work of the Church becomes a passion in their own hearts and consciences, our board may continue to do what they may or can, by way of organizing forward movements, and devising new methods for exploiting the churches for money, the chariot wheels of foreign missions will drive heavily." I believe every word of this, and while I honor the young men who have begun and developed so hopefully the Forward Movement in our own Church, it has seemed to me a serious reflection on our pastors that the services of these young men were, and

Digitized by Google

are, needed. Any man, called of God, and laboring where God has placed him, ought, with God's help, to be equal to the demands of that place.

Brethren, go forth resolved to rouse the Church to prayer, to real, downright, earnest prayer. This is the primary and urgent need. All else will follow. We are accustomed to represent that the last word of Christ was the word of command, bidding his disciples go. But not so. His last command was a command not to go—it was a command to tarry, and we see how that was interpreted as a command to pray. Prayer brought Pentecost, and Pentecost brought both men and money. Jesus knew it would; and Jesus knows it will. The divine order is prayer, and Pentecost and missions. If we will only pray, if we can only arouse the Church to pray, God will give the Pentecost, and then missions will take charge of themselves.

Prayer was the key that unlocked the heavens of old. Elijah once carried that key. Did you ever notice how he used it? See him on Carmel. He has just gained a great, and what he deems a decisive, victory over idolatry, and he thinks the time has come for the long penal drought to end. The people have shouted with great enthusiasm: "The Lord, he is God," and so he thinks they ought to have rain. He prostrates himself, Oriental fashion, and prays. He rises and looks for a cloud. Strange that he should expect one so soon, but he did, and was disappointed. Sent his servant to the top of the hill to look out over the sea. "Surely there must be a cloud somewhere." But the servant returns and tells him he can see one nowhere. Then, down on his knees again, and again he looks for the cloud. Again he sends his servant. Again disappointed. Down he goes again, and again he expects a cloud. Six prayers, six sending of the servant, six disappointments. But he had the key, he knew he had it, and down he went again, and you remember the sequel. When we learn to pray like Elijah, we shall see the cloud, and the showers of blessing.

Digitized by Google

MISSIONS IN THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

By Rev A. L. Phillips, D. D.

Present Conditions.

There is scarcely a Sunday-school in our Church that has not felt, that does not now feel, some missionary impulse. Here will be found a superintendent, there a teacher, yonder a pupil, who has heard the Lord's call, "Go ye." Some missionary information has been given by book, or leaflet, or address. Some missionary desire has been awakened by song or prayer or story. This interest has expressed itself through missionary offerings. For the year ending March 31, 1906, the Sunday-schools gave $3,615 to Assembly's Home Missions, and the churches gave $32,-119; or ten per cent. came from the schools. The churches gave $127,993 to Foreign Missions, and the schools gave $7,646, or the six per cent came from the schools. The amount of money does not express the whole interest taken in missions by these schools. Children control little money, but give liberally of what they have. The problem before us is how to preserve the interest that now exists, and how to increase it indefinitely.

Base Interest on Information.

The Sunday-school is, above all else, a place of instruction. It has one text-book, and all the schools study the same lesson every Sunday. Around the weekly Bible lesson all other exercises must revolve. The Bible must have first place. It is evident, then, that we must manage in some way to have the Bible lesson deal with missions. Two methods are recommended for doing this. First, use should be made of every current lesson in the International series that is of clearly a missionary character. In 1907 there are quite a number of such, four of which are here indicated: First Quarter, Lesson IX., Intercession as a Factor in the World's Redemption; Second Quarter, Lesson VIII., Preparation for Leadership; Third Quarter, Lesson X., Universal Remedy for Universal Sin; Fourth Quarter, Lesson VII., God's Method for the Conquest of the Home-Land. In

Digitized by Google

addition to this missionary treatment of the whole lessons, we may have illustrations of faith, repentance, "works of Christian usefulness," drawn directly from the mission fields at home and abroad. In the lives of men like Judson, Livingston and Paton can be found most enlightening illustrations of the Holy Word.

Second, all well-regulated modern Sunday-schools include supplemental lessons, by which instruction may be given in the history, doctrine and activities of the denomination. Here is an admirable opportunity for introducing missions by the judicious use of effective leaflets, and especially of such books as Trull's Supplemental Missionary Lessons. To neglect this matter of missionary instruction is now inexcusable. Lesson material may be found that is at once scientific and practical. To neglect is to sacrifice the missionary life of the young folks. Pastors may quietly insist upon the introduction of this work, confident that thus they will be laying a foundation for enlarged missionary zeal.

Opening and Closing Exercises.

In opening and closing his school, the wise superintendent has an excellent opportunity for developing the missionary life of his school. Now and then he may, with safety and profit, select a passage from the Bible that will convey its own powerful lesson after a simple word of explanation. Such passages as Psalm ii., Isa. lx. and the like, will lift up any school. In his prayers he will rejoice to make mention, Sunday by Sunday, of the missionaries and of their work everywhere. If his church should have the good fortune to have a pastor on the foreign or frontier field. it will be most helpful for him to pray for him by name. Now and then he may use a special and separate prayer for missions, bringing this emphasis to bear on his school. People learn much truth through the songs and hymns they sing. What a call to duty is in such hymns as "From Greenland's Icy Mountains," or "Jesus Shall Reign Where'er the Sun," or "The Morning Light is Breaking," or "The Son of God goes forth to War," or "Publish Glad Tidings." When he comes near to the time of the regular missionary offerings for missions, he may, with great profit, take pains to explain to his school the nature of the work, the reasons for giving to it, and the principles governing a Christian's giving. Such a course will inevitably increase the school's offerings manifold if carefully and patiently followed.

Digitized by Google

Missionary Books.

In a Sunday-school institute, recently held, one of our most painstaking pastors publicly said that the introduction of a good modern library to his school had marked a distinct advance in the spiritual interests of his own large family of children. No Sunday-school library should be considered complete without a substantial number of well-selected modern missionary books. We should not be satisfied with books a half, or even a quarter, century old. The old standards should be present, but new ones should be carefully placed, such as James Gilmour and his Boys, The Cobra's Den, Mackay of Uganda, Topsy-Turvy Land, Candida, Autobiography of Paton, etc., etc. They should be mixed in with the other books in the library. The librarian may be most helpful here by using every means available to get them read. In this the teacher, too, may do good service.

Various Accessories.

A school should certainly possess a large missionary map of the world, with the missions of its own denomination plainly marked on it, so as to be visible from any part of the room. Frequent reference may be made to it, and thus the school will become familiar with the progress being made in all the world. It will be well to have some of the pupils make big maps of certain mission fields to show details of work, especially of the man or station in which the school is specially interested. Missionary pictures, showing the life of people in the different fields may now be had cheap. The schools should be well supplied with these. A cabinet of curios, well selected and carefully kept, will afford objects for illustration. A bulletin of current events, drawn and illustrated by some gifted pupil, may be hung in the vestibule to catch the attention of the pupils and others passing by. These accessories are cheap, many of them can be made by the pupils, and all should be so made when practicable.

Missionary Entertainments.

Every progressive superintendent now provides for occasional entertainments for his school. The annual Christmas tree and picnic, in the spring, belong, of right, to the children. They cannot be neglected with impunity. It will do great good to have,

Digitized by Google

among the social features of the school, several carefully prepared missionary entertainments during the winter. The use of the stereoptican in this service is especially desirable. The home field, as well as the foreign, should be illustrated. Different classes might take up this work for themselves, and so increase the class-spirit and enlarge their numbers. A Japan tea at the teacher's house would be educative as well as pleasing, if it were carefully planned.

Effective Organization.

If it be asked, "What form of organization will be most effective to aid these plans?" it may be replied, there are two ways. In the Methodist churches the Sunday-schools are all organized into missionary societies with their own officers. Once a month each school resolves itself into a missionary meeting, when its officers take charge, and a program is rendered. This is an excellent plan and works well when intelligently handled. Another plan is to organize a Missionary Department in the school, to consist of a committee of five. Its chairman should be an assistant superintendent of the school. Let this committee be charged with the duty of promoting the missionary life and activities of the school. It should be very carefully selected for efficiency and zeal. Definite responsibility promotes conscientious action. Hence the work of this committee should be carefully outlined and distributed amongst its members. For example, the chairman may be charged with the duty of helping the superintendent make the opening and closing exercises give their message for missions. To another member may be given the duty of promoting the missionary giving of the school. To another, the duty of suggesting to the Library Committee or librarian the names of suitable missionary books for all grades of the school. Another may take the oversight of the accessories, and help in many ways to make them useful. Another may help with the missionary entertainments. The committee should meet regularly and make definite written reports to the superintendent of the school. This, in substance, is the plan adopted by our General Assembly. It is progressive, practical and effective. If faithfully and continuously used, it will help to increase the missionary interest of the schools manifold.

Digitized by Google

No Need of Delay.

This plan can be adopted and put to work with very little delay. There is nothing radical or silly about it. It has been in use. It is approved by good sense in that it adds no useless machinery, simply providing a way to do work that is waiting to be done. It is progressive. It has the approval of the General Assembly. It should be introduced this fall into every school in our Church. Our Lord's command admits of no delay. We should be hard at work training up a new generation of those who will evangelize the world in this generation.

Digitized by Google

THE ROD OF AARON.*

(Num. 17: 1-13.)

By Rev. Russell Cecil, D. D.

I am here to-day, brethren, by the invitation of your president, to address you at the opening of the ninety-fifth session of this Seminary, a task which he himself, of course, is far better fitted, both by nature and experience, to perform than I am, and which I undertake with some hesitation. I deem it, however, a privilege to speak to you on such an occasion, and I hope, by the aid of the Spirit, to say something which shall at least be wholesome and profitable.

More than twenty-five years of active service in the pastorate, perhaps, entitles me to speak with some degree of assurance to younger brethren upon those subjects in which all ministers of the Gospel are concerned. Some of you are just entering upon your course of study, in preparation for the ministry; some of you are returning, to continue the work already begun, and some are hoping this year to complete it; but all of you, whatever may be your stage of preparation, are doubtless in a state of mind to listen with patience and appreciation to words of counsel from those who have been in the ministry before you. I have the deepest sympathy for you in your work, and envy you the privilege of three years of quiet study in this pleasant retreat, and under such able and experienced instructors as you have in this institution.

In casting about in my mind for a subject, I thought of that interesting incident in the history of the Jews, when the authority of Moses and Aaron having been questioned by certain sons of Kohath and Reuben, a question of both civil and religious interest, Moses, in obedience to the command of God, took twelve rods, representing the twelve tribes, and laid them up in the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord over night, and the next morning, when they were taken out, it was dis-

*An address delivered at the opening of Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va., September 12, 1906, 4 P. M.

Digitized by Google

covered that the rod for the tribe of Levi, with Aaron's name upon it, "was budded, and brought forth buds, and bloomed blossoms, and yielded almonds." (Num. xvii. 8.) This was given to the people as a sign that the priesthood belonged to the tribe of Levi and the house of Aaron. This singular incident is highly significant to all who enter upon the work of the holy ministry.

It is suggestive of several useful thoughts, to which I wish now to ask your earnest attention.

I. The true minister is *chosen of God.* This was the point in question. Korah and his company contended that "all the congregation were holy, every one of them," and that Moses and Aaron were taking "too much upon themselves," and "lifting themselves up above the congregation of the Lord." (Num. xvi. 3.)

Moses had not assumed any authority whatever which had not been divinely thrust upon him, and he proposed, according to his usual custom, to refer the matter to the Lord. "Even to-morrow the Lord will shew who are his, and who is holy." (v. 5). The controversy, so far as the civil and religious authority of Moses and Aaron was concerned, was settled the next day by the miraculous destruction of the insurgents. The earth opened and swallowed up Korah and his company, and fire from God consumed the two hundred and fifty men who offered incense. (Num. xvi. 32-35.) But then the people murmured against Moses and Aaron, saying, "Ye have killed the people of the Lord." Then a plague broke out among them, and fourteen thousand seven hundred died before the plague was stayed by the intercession of Aaron, who stood between the living and the dead with a burning censer in his hand, and made atonement for them. (Num. xvi. 46-49). After this Moses, by the divine direction, proposed the test of the twelve rods laid up before the Lord in the Tabernacle of Witness, and God said to him, "And it shall come to pass that the man's rod *whom I shall choose,* shall blossom, and I will make to cease from me the murmuring of the children of Israel, whereby they murmur against you. (xvii. 5.) When it was discovered on the morrow that the rod which bore the name of Aaron upon it had blossomed and yielded almonds, the question of the divine call of Aaron to the priestly office was finally disposed of.

Digitized by Google

We cannot make too much, brethren, of the divine call to the ministry. Two parties should be convinced that every man who assumes this office has been called of God, the one the man himself, and the other the people. The apostle says: "No man taketh this honor to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." (Heb. v. 4.) I pity the man who suffers himself to enter the ministry unless he is satisfied in his own mind that God has designed him for it, and has indicated clearly His will in the matter. It is dangerous for any one to presume to perform a sacred service who has not been divinely designated for it. He who dares to do so imperils his own soul, and also the interests of the kingdom. He has no message, he hears not the voice of the Spirit in the Word, and hence his work must be purely lifeless and mechanical. What can he hope for himself? What power of good has he with the people? What is there to sustain him in the long years of labor and sorrow and disappointment which stretch away in the distant future before him? But if a man is thoroughly satisfied of his case, then nothing in the way of earthly trial can break his spirit or deter him from the discharge of his duty. I trust, my friends, that in the depth of your own souls you can respond to that sentiment of Tennyson—

> "Sunset and evening star,
> And one clear call for me."

It is almost as important also that the people should be convinced of your call. Many are eager to hear the message to their souls from any true ambassador of God, and if they have good reason in believing that you are such, they honor you and hearken to your words. But how sadly disappointed they are when the preacher has nothing for them and they have to listen to a string of words and platitudes, and to discourses more or less secular in character and destitute of the bread of life! They have no sympathy for the man whom they do not believe to be called, who runs when he has not been sent, and who presumes to deliver a message which he has not received from God. It is not an exaggeration to say that during the history of the church the cause of Christ has suffered not a little from the advocacy of men who have not been called of God to this office, as was Aaron.

II. The true minister must be *separated from the world.* The

Digitized by Google

priests of the tribe of Levi and of the house of Aaron had to be separated from the body of the people and prepared by an elaborate ceremony of purification for the exercise of the functions of their sacred office. I will not pause to speak of this ceremony which is doubtless familiar at least to most of you. It made a distinction between them and their brethren. They were set apart from the others and regarded as holy. This distinction was offensive to the sons of Kohath and Reuben, and furnished occasion for their rebellion against the priestly authority. Their contention was: "All the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them." This was, of course, in a sense true; they were all the chosen people of God; but it was also true that out of their number God selected the house of Aaron to be separated from their brethren in order to minister before him in holy things.

Now, of course we do not believe that the ministers of the Gospel of the New Testament are priests in the sense that Aaron and his sons were. They exercise some priestly functions, as authoritatively expounding the revealed will of God to the people, and in making intercession for them at the throne of grace, but the functions of their office are, in the main, rather ministerial than sacerdotal. But while this is true, it is clear from the Gospel narratives that Jesus chose a body of men, whom he called apostles, or messengers, and separated from the world and even from his other disciples, and ordained them to the special work of preaching and ruling in the church. The apostles followed their Master's example in organizing the church, and also chose and ordained men to the ministerial office. Now these men are not only called of God to their work, but they also are to be separated from the world.

Now, there is not a little confusion in the minds of many upon this subject of separation of ministers from the world. In some ages of the church and in some branches of it still, it has led to the error of monasticism, and men who sought for holiness have imagined that it called for seclusion, peculiarities of dress, and ascetic living. But it does not mean separation from the ordinary life and activities of the world. The apostles of our Lord lived among men and mingled with them, and until the church had grown sufficiently strong to provide for their support, and permit them to give themselves wholly to preaching

Digitized by Google

and other religious exercises, they evidently sustained themselves by engaging in the ordinary work of the world. Ministers in early churches did the same. Ministers, however, when it can be avoided, should not engage in secular pursuits or permit themselves to come under the power of secularizing influences. But it is possible for the minister to live among men, go where they are, share in their daily interests and perplexities, sorrows and trials, and yet not become secularized. It is unfortunate for him to appear distant and unapproachable. It is a mistake for him to act as if he were afraid of becoming contaminated by his association with fellowmen. That kind of separation is not required of him, and neutralizes to a degree his influence for good. But the kind of separation which he should be careful to maintain is separation from evil. Our Lord in his last prayer with the apostles said, "I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil." (John xvii. 15.) This world is your arena for action, the sphere in which your work must be done, and you must not attempt to flee from it, but only to separate yourself from evil in whatever form it may appear, whether in error of doctrine or of life. It is not easy, my brethren, to separate yourselves from error which seems to be floating upon every breeze. If you "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," some will accuse you of narrowness and others of self-righteousness; but error in doctrine is as dangerous as error in life; if not more so; it is of the world, and the servant of God must keep himself unspotted from the world. These are times when our loyalty to truth and righteousness is being put to the test and the problem perpetually before us is: Shall we separate ourselves from evil, or shall we compromise with it in order to retain the sympathy and the support of the world? Of course, there is only one proper solution of it, and that is the settled purpose to seek to know the truth in its simplicity, separated from error, and to devote ourselves to the defense and propagation of it.

III. The true minister must be *consecrated to service.* This expression has become somewhat hackneyed in our day, but it concerns a serious matter, the importance of which can hardly be exaggerated. Why were Aaron and his sons separated from their brethren? In order that they might be devoted or consecrated to religious service. It has been said that we may dedi-

Digitized by Google

cate ourselves to God, but that He himself must consecrate us. Consecration means set apart to sacred uses, when men may be separated from their brethren for various purposes, for example, for war; but Aaron and his sons were separated from others in order that they might be consecrated by God to the holy priesthood. Aaron's rod, which was of course a symbol of the priesthood, was preserved in the ark of the covenant along with the golden pot of manna and the tables of the law, "as a token against the rebels" (v. 10). It remained there as a permanent sign to the people that God chooses his own servants for the sacred services of the sanctuary; that he separates them from others; and that he consecrates them by methods of his own selection. Its presence in the ark in the Holy of Holies was an indication of the holy character of the priests' office and of the spiritual nature of the work to which they were called. It was a warning to the usurper who might be tempted to take this office to himself; it was an emblem to the people of the divine provision for their spiritual needs; and it was a perpetual reminder to the priests themselves that they owed their elevation to God and to him therefore they would have to render their accounts. Such an office surely demanded of those who filled it deep piety of spirit and holiness of life.

During the progress of the plague, as I have already mentioned, while the people were dying at a frightful rate, Aaron, with a burning censer of incense in his hand, "ran in the midst of the congregation," and, "standing between the dead and the living, "made an atonement for the people," "and the plague was stayed" (Num. xvi. 46-48). This was both a sample and a symbol of the work of the priesthood as it was also of the Christian ministry. The place of the minister is between the dead and the living, preaching the Gospel of Atonement for sin through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. It is to this solemn and holy task that he is consecrated by Almighty God. Men who are dying in sin look to him for life. God has made the atonement through his Son; it is the duty of the minister to proclaim it. He is taxed with this and with nothing else. To do this he is called of God, separated from his brethren, and consecrated by the holy ordinances of the church. There is no higher office among men.

IV. The true minister must be *fruitful of good works.*

Digitized by Google

Aaron's rod of all the twelve was the only one that budded, blossomed and yielded almonds. Of course this indicated that he would be fruitful in the priest's office. He was not chosen and consecrated to this office by the divine grace simply to occupy it as a position of honor and emolument, but he was to use the office in the holy service of God and the people.

This is the end of the ministry, brethren, into which you are called by the Spirit. You are called unto good works, and not only in the general sense, as this is true of all God's people, but you are called to the specific work of serving in word and doctrine in such a way as to lead souls to saving knowledge of Christ.

I remember while a student in the Seminary of paying a visit to the pastor of my youth, under whose preaching I found the Saviour, and who was then rapidly approaching the end of his earthly career, and he made one remark which deeply impressed me at the time, and has remained with me ever since. The remark was this: "My young brother, do not be satisfied with a fruitless ministry. Many pastors console themselves in the barren results of their labors with the thought that they have no evangelistic gifts; and of course," he said, "Men are differently endowed in that respect, but do not, I beseech you, rest content without bringing souls to Christ, and thus giving full proof of the ministry to which God has called you."

The Lord Jesus expects us to bear fruit. He sends us forth with this end in view. You have not failed to observe how impressively he dwells upon this point in his talks with his disciples. "Herein is my Father glorified that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples." Thus do we bring glory to God, and thus do we give proof of true discipleship. We should desire to bear fruit in the salvation of souls, and we should pray for grace and strength to do it. Now, the purpose of Christ and our own desire in this matter are both covered by one weighty remark of his to the twelve in the upper room: "Ye did not choose me, but I chose you, and appointed you, that ye should go and bear fruit, and that your fruit should abide: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, He may give it you." (John xv. 16.) Thus He says the double purpose in their selection and appointment was that they should bear permanent fruit, and that their prayers in his name should be answered. So it appears that in the purpose of the Master fruitfulness and

Digitized by Google

prayer are co-ordinate and inseparable. To appreciate this great truth, and to act upon it, is without doubt the secret of a fruitful ministry. Preaching and praying are both essential to fruitfulness.

Brethren, let me urge you to be diligent in your study of the Scripture, and in prayer, that you may understand the purport of your holy calling, and you may go out from here at the end of your course prepared to fulfil a fruitful and happy ministry.

Digitized by Google

UNION SEMINARY MAGAZINE.

EDITORIAL STAFF.

DAVID HOPKINS ROLSTON, *Editor.*

ALFRED S. ANDERSON, *Associate Editor.*
S. MC. P. GLASGOW, *Associate Editor.*
GASTON BOYLE, *Missionary Editor.*
LYLE MOORE MOFFETT, *Associate Missionary Editor.*

PROF. W. W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D., *Review Editor.*
PROF. T. C. JOHNSTON, D. D., LL. D., *Review Editor.*
THOMAS W. HOOPER, JR., *Book Editor.*
HUGH H. HUDSON, *Business Manager.*

Published bi-monthly during the Seminary session by the students of Union Theological Seminary, in Virginia.

Change of address, discontinuance, or failure to receive the Magazine regularly should be reported promptly by mail to the Business Manager.

Terms: One dollar a year, in advance; single copy, twenty-five cents.

Editorial.

In a recent conversation between a seminary student and a pastor of several years' experience, the subject of the eldership of our beloved Church came into discussion. The pastor lamented the fact that our elders generally are not now as active and useful in the Church's labors as the history of the Church in the past leads us to believe that they once were. In his own pastorate, a city church of some importance, the pastor said there was only one elder who would raise his voice in public prayer, and that even he did it reluctantly. Moreover, in the sphere of personal work in the way of privately admonishing those whose lives are not consistent with the gospel they profess, and in privately urging the claims of the gospel on the unconverted, the pastor feared that there were very few who did anything at all.

We do not propose to discuss here the duties of this divinely-appointed office, but we wish merely to raise the question in the minds of our readers as to whether, from their experiences as pastors and elders and laymen, the fears of the pastor above referred to are well grounded. Is his pastorate an isolated case, or is it one of many?

If the latter, it is to be lamented. The office of the elder is one of such large opportunity, that if it is not used well the

Digitized by Google

cause of Christ must suffer in consequence. In one respect, at least, the godly elder has opportunity for a more powerful influence than the pastor can have. When he reproves or admonishes the sinner and strives with the unconverted, they are apt to feel that is solely because of his love for their souls, while, in the case of the pastor, they sometimes, doubtless, feel that it is a matter of business with him, that he is paid to do that, and that he cares more for the success of his pastorate, for the advantages that will come to him thereby, than he does for their souls.

From considerations like this, it is certainly to be lamented if the case of the pastorate above mentioned is a fair sample of what prevails in our Church to-day.

And whose fault is it? And wherein lies the remedy? All these questions arise when we begin to study the subject. We believe it would be profitable to the readers of this magazine if some one would publish in these pages a full discussion of the subject.

We can hardly leave this subject, however, without an additional thought in connection with it. While the opportunity of the elder for personal work is, in the respect above mentioned, somewhat greater than that of the pastor, the opportunity of an earnest, faithful, Christian layman is certainly a near approach to it.

Nor need the pastor feel that, because there is this attitude on the part of those who need his counsel, of imputing to him selfish motives, that he is excused from his duty to them thereby. A brief experience in this work will demonstrate the fact that men are usually more willing to be approached on these subjects than some of us are to approach them.

The Union Seminary Magazine has a distinct place to fill in the current literature of our Church. It is the purpose of The Magazine Association to have it fill that place. In order to do this, subjects of timely and universal interest must be freely discussed in its pages. Many subjects that suggest themselves to our pastors and teachers and laymen, would if fully treated, be too long to find a place in the weekly papers of our church. The

Digitized by Google

Magazine is the place to publish these and set them before the foremost and most influential people of our Church, for they are the readers of the *Union Seminary Magazine*. "Let the truth be held aloft and shaken" was suggested in class a few days ago, in order that as a torch "by the shaking it may shine the more." Out of the material that comes to hand for publication, we shall endeavor to select the best, and hope that our judgment may not go far astray.

We find that the impression has somehow gotten abroad that *The Union Seminary Magazine* is the product of the students of the Seminary. Of course, any one who is a subscriber and a regular reader of it, knows that this is not the case. Its pages have always contained articles of timely interest from the pens of the ablest writers in our own Church, and other churches, and can always be read with interest and profit. Usually the only thing in the magazine from the pen of a student in the seminary, is the editorial matter, and that does not often exceed two or three pages. We ask our readers to disabuse the minds of others, who ought to be readers of the things published in this magazine, of this false impression as opportunity may present itself.

There has been request, on the part of some of our readers, for more sermons from able preachers. The majority of our readers being preachers, they are anxious to see how our ablest preachers handle important subjects. The present issue contains several sermons of a high order, and we hope to publish more of the same kind in the future, aiming, however, to maintain a due sense of proportion in this as in other matters.

Any suggestions for a wider usefulness for the Magazine will be gratefully received and given careful consideration.

D. H. R.

We would express to the Theological Seminary of Kentucky our fraternal sympathy in the heavy loss which it has sustained in the death of the Rev. Francis R. Beattie, D. D., LL. D., for thirteen years Professor of Apologetics and Systematic Theology in that institution. Dr. Beattie was a native of Guelph, Ontario, Canada, and a graduate of Toronto University and of Knox College. After a brief pastorate in Canada, he became, in 1888, the Professor of Apologetics and the Relations of Science and

Digitized by Google

Revelation in the Theological Seminary at Columbia, S. C. The position at that time was one of peculiar difficulty, but Dr. Beattie, though coming into our Church as an entire stranger, not only gave satisfaction by his instructions, but won many friends by his sauvity and tact. After five years' service at Columbia, he accepted the position at Louisville, which he continued to hold till the time of his death. He died suddenly on Monday night, September 3rd, of neuralgia of the heart.

He was an accomplished and versatile man, and a very hard worker, and touched the life of the Church at a great many points as preacher, professor, presbyter, editor, author and member of the Executive Commission of the Western Section of the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance. He was a sound theologian, a scholar of wide reading, and an enthusiastic teacher, greatly beloved by his colleagues and students. To them and to the seminary which he served with the most ardent devotion and to which he gave the most faithful and arduous labors, we extend our sincere condolence.

Digitized by Google

The Seminary.

The following students have matriculated at Union Seminary for the year:

JUNIOR CLASS.

A. R. Harrison, Paw Creek, N. C., Mecklenburg Presbytery, A. B. of Davidson College.

W. S. Cain, Asheville, N. C., Asheville Presbytery, University of North Carolina.

H. L. Cathey, Steeles Creek, N. C., Mecklenburg Presbytery, A. B. of Davidson College.

J. F. Coleman, Soddy, Tenn., Knoxville Presbytery, B. S. of Davidson College.

S. O. Coxe, Atlanta, Ga., Atlanta Presbytery, North Alabama Baptist College.

R. D. Dickson, Raeford, N. C., Fayetteville Presbytery, A. B. of Davidson College.

J. F. Gorrell, Greensboro, N. C., Orange Presbytery, B. S. of Davidson College.

W. W. Grover, Richmond, Va., East Hanover Presbytery, A. B. of Hampden-Sidney College.

A. P. Hassell, Davidson, N. C., Concord Presbytery, A. B. of Davidson College.

D. W. McIver, Jr., Montgomery, Ala., East Alabama Presbytery, Davidson College.

M. A. Ray, Galatia, N. C., Fayetteville Presbytery, A. B. of Davidson College.

W. A. Reveley, Lexington, Va., Lexington Presbytery, A. B. of Washington and Lee University.

F. B. Smith, Atlanta, Ga., Atlanta Presbytery.

W. T. Thompson, Jr., Washington, D. C., A. B. of Davidson lege.

R. C. White, Clinton, N. Y., Norfolk Presbytery, Ph. D. of milton College.

Digitized by Google

L. McC. Williams, Newport News, Va., Norfolk Presbytery, A. B. of Washington and Lee University.

W. Twyman Williams, Woodstock, Va., Lexington Presbytery, M. A. of Hampden-Sidney College.

J. A. Wood, Johnson City, Tenn., Holston Presbytery, A. B. of King College.

Joseph Zaiden, Sidon, Syria, Lexington Presbytery, Davis and Elkins College.

J. Hoge Smith, New Orleans, La., New Orleans Presbytery, A. B. Presbyterian College of South Carolina.

SENIOR CLASS.

Alfred Scott Anderson, Ivy Depot, Va., William and Mary College.

Walter Washington Bain, Wade, N. C., A. B. of Davidson College.

George Francis Bell, Putney's, Va., A. B. of Hampden-Sidney College.

Gaston Boyle, Fredericksburg, Va., A. B. of Fredericksburg College.

Eugene Black Carr, Safe, N. C., A. B. of Davidson College.

Pleasant Linwood Clark, Brookneal, Va., A. B. of Hampden-Sidney College.

Ralph Carroll Deal, Greenville, S. C., A. M., of Davidson Collelge.

Thos. W. Hooper, Jr., Christiansburg, Va., A. B., B. S. of Hampden-Sidney College.

Hugh Hardin Hudson, Madisonville, Tenn., A. B. of Princeton University.

Robertson MacFadyen, Pr. E. Is. Canada, Grant University.

Angus R. McQueen, Carthage, N. C., A. B. of Davidson College.

Wm. Sanford Patterson, Winston-Salem, N. C., A. B., of Davidson College.

David Hopkins Rolston, Harrisonburg, Va., A. B., Washington and Lee University.

John Calvin Siler, Hedgesville, W. Va., A. B. Hampden-Sidney College.

George Brazier Thompson, Bayou Current, La.

Digitized by Google

MIDDLE CLASS.

W. C. Wauchope, Harrisonburg, Va., A. B. of Harvard University.

Wm. Waddell Arrowood, Clover, S. C., A. B. of Davidson College.

F. W. Blackburn, Grottoes, Va., A. B. of University of Virginia.

Joseph Allan Christian, Richmond, Va., A. B. of Hampden-Sidney College.

James Frank Emmett Clark, Abingdon, Va., A. B. of King College.

Jack Holman Clarke, Clinton, S. C., A. B. of Presbyterian College of South Carolina.

Lowry Davis, Greenville, S. C., A. B. of Southwestern Presbyterian University.

Frank Lee Delaney, Bristol, Tenn., A. B. of King College.

Samuel McPheeters Glasgow, Lexington, Va., A. B. of Washington and Lee University.

Frederick William Gray, Charlotte, N. C., A. B. of Catawba College.

J. Harlin Gruver, Reliance, Va., A. B. of Washington and Lee University.

John William Hethorn, McFarland's, Va., Hampden-Sidney College.

Harry Moseley Jenkins, Shuqualak, Miss., A. B. of King College.

Robert Alberti Lapsley, Jr., Ashland, Va., A. B. of Washington and Lee University.

L. W. Matthews, Providence, N. C., A. M. of Princeton University.

James M. McChesney, Bristol, Tenn., A. B. of King College.

Murphy Bethune McLauchlin, Red Springs, N. C., Davidson College.

Lyle Moore Moffett, Staunton, Va., A. B. of Washington and Lee University.

George Coit Moore, Sherman, Texas, A. B. of Austin College.

Robert Long Offield, Emmetts, Tenn., A. B., of King College.

Henry Ward Shannon, Gastonia, N. C., A. B. of Davidson College.

Digitized by Google

Augustus Worth Shaw, Lumber Bridge, N. C., A. B. of Davidson College.

Flournoy Shepperson, Batesville, Ark., A. B. of Arkansas College.

Charles T. Squires, St. Louis, Mo.

Rev. Hugh W. Sublett, Richmond, Va., A. B., A. M. of Richmond College.

Geo. McAllister Telford, Maysville, Ga., A. B. of University of Georgia.

James Cary Walker, Baltimore, Md., Maryland School for the Blind.

W. C. Wauchope, Harrisonburg, Va., A. B. of Harvard University.

F. W. Woody, Goldsburg, N. C., A. B. of Guilford College.

Digitized by Google

Books.

REVIEW STAFF.

PROF. JOHN I. ARMSTRONG, B. D., Hampden-Sidney, Va.
REV. EGBERT W. SMITH, D. D., Greensboro, N. C.
REV. A. A. MCGEACHY, Sherman, Texas.
REV. HARRIS E. KIRK, Baltimore, Md.
PROF. THOS. C. JOHNSON, D. D., LL. D., Richmond, Va.
PROF. C. C. HERSMAN, D. D., LL. D., Richmond, Va.
PROF. W. W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D., Richmond, Va.
REV. D. P. MCGEACHY, Lenoir, N. C.
REV. WALTER L. LINGLE, Rock Hill, S. C.
REV. RUSSELL CECIL, D. D., Richmond, Va.
REV. R. E. VINSON, Austin, Texas.
REV. T. M. LOWRY, D. D., Knoxville, Tenn.
REV. THERON H. RICE, D. D., Atlanta, Ga.
PROF. G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D., Richmond, Va.
PROF. THOS. R. ENGLISH, D. D., Richmond, Va.
PROF. J. G. MCALLISTER, B. D., Hampdan-Sidney, Va.

Any book noticed in these pages may be had at publishers' prices through the Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va.

REVIEWS.

THE STUDENT AND THE MODERN MISSIONARY CRUSADE. Addresses delivered before the Fifth International Convention of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, Nashville, Tenn., February 28—March 4, 1906. Student Volunteer Movement, 3 west Twenty-ninth street, New York, N. Y. $1.50, post paid to any address.

This inspiring volume of seven hundred pages is filled with splendid addresses and valuable missionary information. In the Nashville Conference, the fifth and greatest of all the student conferences, 716 institutions were represented and 4,235 delegates enrolled. It was a wonderful gathering, even for this age of conventions, not only in its numerical strength, but also in the high degree of mentality and spiritual power which characterized many of the addresses. The Student Volunteer Movement, of which this convention was the outcome, represents the high tide of modern missionary enterprise. One can not read the addresses of Dr. George Robson, Bishop Hartzell, the Rev. Donald Fraser, and several others whose names are perhaps more familiar to the readers of this magazine without feeling that of all the world movements of our

Digitized by Google

day no other is equal to that which has for its end the evangelization of the heathen in this generation. The programme was divided into sections, the topic for each section being some phase of the general subject, and the topics were usually treated with ability and thoroughness. It is not easy to determine which of these sections contains the best addresses and is of most interest. For ourselves we read with peculiar pleasure the addresses in the section devoted to "Missions and Their Wider Relationships." One of these was by the present British Ambassador in this country, Sir Henry Mortimer Durand, and another by the Hon. John W. Foster, one of the best known of our own diplomatists. These gentlemen discussed calmly and without prejudice the relations of missions in State affairs in foreign countries, and effectively replied to the adverse criticisms of a class of travelers and traders who have nothing good to say of missionaries and their work. Another address in this section on "The Secular Press and Foreign Missions," by Mr. Z. A. MacDonald, editor-in-chief of the Toronto *Globe*, is one of the ablest, most fair-minded, and satisfactory in the book.

The volume is a thesaurus of knowledge, and will prove valuable in the hands of pastors and other students of missionary matters.

RUSSELL CECIL.

THE CALL OF THE HOME LAND. *By A. L. Phillips, D. D.* Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va. Pp. 173. Price, cloth, 50 cents; paper, 35 cents.

This book is just like its author. You see him on every page. It is bristling with life and energy. The sentences are short and clear and to the point. All seven chapters of the book are on vital subjects connected with mission work in our home land. He writes of the mountaineer, the immigrant, the negro, the country church, and the boy. The book is intended for the use of Mission Study Classes, and is well suited to that purpose. When I took it up I expected it to cover about the same ground that I went over in Dr. Morris' book, "At Our Own Door," a year ago. Indeed it does cover the same ground, but the treatment is very different. If I had stopped a moment and gotten a clear picture of the two authors before my mind I might have known that before I read a page. I hope that the book is going to be the means of calling many of our young people, to whom it is addressed, to the great work in the home land.

WALTER L. LINGLE.

CHRISTUS REDEMPTOR. *By Helen Barrett Montgomery.* Pp. 282. Price, 50 cents.

This little book tells the story of Missions in the South Sea Islands. There is no more thrilling story in the annals of Church history. The book is primarily intended for the use of Mission Study Classes, and is well suited for that purpose, but it makes interesting and profitable reading apart from Study Classes. The author has done her work well.

Digitized by Google

I do not see how she could have told the story better. I hope that it will lead some to read the fuller lives of John Williams, John G. Paton, James Chalmers, and others. WALTER L. LINGLE.

THE PRETTYWAYS O' PROVIDENCE. *By Mark Guy Pearse.* Jennings & Graham. $1.00.

This is a series of folk-lore stories, thirteen in number, on various subjects—such as courtship, and various incidents as are constantly occurring among a people. The name is misleading. One would at first conclude it was an illustration of a merciful Providence over all. The word "Providence" in the book has the significance of "coincidence"—the unexpected and at times the pleasant termination of a certain course of events. Some of these stories are more interesting than others. In the hot summer days of August, when one is not disposed to tax the mind with serious reading, it is a suitable book to while away the time. It can not be charged that these stories have any high moral lesson; while in the "Smuggler" and others there may be a letting down of a moral tone in "the wink of the eye" for the tippler. T. M. L.

BOOK NOTES.

1. EXPOSITIONS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. *By Alexander Maclaren, D. D.*

Dr. Alexander Maclaren is the last of the great imperial preachers. He is the prince of expositors. I doubt whether any living man knows the Scriptures as well as he. I know that no man can expound them as he can. In his old age he has placed all his printed sermons and expositions and all his manuscripts in the hands of Dr. Robertson Nicoll, who is editing them and putting them into the form of a commentary on the whole of the Bible. Sometimes a printed sermon throws most light on a passage, sometimes an exposition, written for the *Sunday-School Times;* sometimes an unpublished manuscript. Whatever it may be, the editor makes use of it. The result is a very full exposition, with enough variety in the style and treatment to keep it from growing monotonous. When the series is completed there will be about thirty volumes. Only eight volumes have come from the press at the present writing. The printer has done all that he can do to make the volumes attractive. I have worked through the three volumes on Matthew. Nothing like it has come my way for a long time. I shall not be satisfied until the entire thirty volumes are safely housed in my library. If a young minister has a good critical commentary on each book of the Bible, and Alexander Maclaren's expositions, he is well equipped so far as homiletic literature is concerned. Several good things come to the man who studies these expositions. There is a great deal of fresh thought. In addition to this, he catches the method of a great preacher and expositor. Not only so, but he turns more and more to expository preaching, which is the preaching which the world needs and wants. Besides all this, he

Digitized by Google

catches no little inspiration as he thinks thoughts and walks in the foot-prints of this man of God. Up to the present date "The Expositor's Bible" has been the most useful complete commentary in my library. I expect Dr. Alexander Maclaren's Expositions of Scripture to supplant it.

2. Books on Winning Souls.

The weakest place in the Christian ministry is along the line of personal work. We preach with all the earnestness of our souls on Sunday, and then go out on Monday and meet men who are not Christians, and talk with them about everything else in the world, but say never a word to them about their souls and eternal life. This goes on year after year. I wonder what they are thinking about us. Sometime ago I spoke to a man in his sixties. It took me nearly four years to do it. He turned to me and said, "Do you know that you are the second minister who ever spoke to me about my soul?" I heard a man who knew all the parties tell this little incident, which occurred up in Illinois: A Presbyterian elder, Mr. Reynolds, had been in business for twenty years beside a dear friend of his who was not a Christian, but had never spoken a word to him about his soul. One day the man turned to Mr. Reynolds and said, "Mr. Reynolds, do you care anything about my soul? Do you care whether I am saved or lost?" "Of course I do," replied Mr. Reynolds, "You know that I love you very dearly." "I cannot believe you, Mr. Reynolds," was the reply. "We have been close friends for twenty years but you have never said a word to me about my soul. The other day I was on a crowded train coming from Chicago. A stranger took his seat beside me. In five minutes he was talking to me about salvation. In ten minutes we were bowing our heads on the back of the seat in front of us and quietly praying that I might be a Christian. The train stopped and the stranger got off. I had forgotten to ask his name. I rushed to the platform and called to him and asked him to give me his name. The reply was 'Dwight L. Moody.' He cared for my soul." I wonder how many of our friends who are not Christians could bring this same charge against us.

One day William Booth heard an infidel lecturer say, "If I believed what some of you Christians believe, I would never rest day nor night telling men about it.' That was the beginning of the Salvation Army. That sentence burned in his heart. He says, "I was made a red-hot salvationist by that infidel lecturer." I wish that this same thought might burn in the heart of every seminary student and that he might become a faithful personal worker before he ever leaves the seminary. I have been reading some helpful books on this subject which I can recommend to those who earnestly desire to win souls for Christ. "Method in Soul-Winning," by Henry C. Mabie, D. D., corresponding secretary of American Baptist Missionary Union; "How to Bring Men to Christ," by Dr. R. A. Torrey; "Studies for Personal Workers," by Dr. Howard Agnew Johnson; "Success in Soul-Winning," by M T. Lamb, with intro-

Digitized by Google

duction by Dr. J. Wilbur Chapman; "Individual Work for Individuals," by Dr. H. Clay Trumbull. This book I read several years ago, but I want to include it in this list and most heartily commend it to all who have never read it

3. THE USE OF THE SCRIPTURES IN THEOLOGY. *By William Newton Clark, D. D.*

The name of this book struck me. My chief objection to all the theologies that I have read is that they do not make large enough use of the Scriptures. They depend too much on reasons, not that I would eliminate reason from religion. I must confess that when I hear the theologians reasoning out deductively what God ought to do under given circumstances, I cannot keep my mind from turning to that verse in Isaiah, "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord." I cannot help feeling that we need to make a larger use of the Scriptures in theology, in other words, that we need more of the Biblical and less of the so-called Dogmatic Theology. This thought caused the title of the book before me to attract my attention. Besides, it had been widely and favorably reviewed. The book is made up of lectures delivered to the students of the Divinity School of Yale University. It is crowded with suggestions and provokes thought on every page. I am glad I read it. But I had not gone far with the author until I found myself at the parting of the ways. I could go with him no further. He lays down as his general proposition that there is a Christian and non-Christian element in the Scriptures and that the theologian must use only the Christian element. So far so good. I think that is true. I remember what a relief it was to me when I first made that discovery in my college days. Inspiration only vouches for a correct record and not for the truth of everything in that record. There is plenty of false philosophy in the Book of Job. It is stated there that it may be refuted. The Scriptures record many sayings of wicked men. Indeed it contains a good many of the sayings of Satan himself. I am not sure that in our proof text method we have always been as careful to distinguish between this Christian and non-Christian element as we might have been. But this is not what the author means by the Christian and non-Christian elements. His idea is that we must so catch the spirit of Christ that we can detect at once whether a statement is in keeping with the spirit of Christ. If in our judgment it is not, then it has no place in theology, no matter who made the statement, whether it was the Apostle Paul, or John, or Jesus himself. Indeed he points out some of the sayings of Jesus which he considers non-Christian. I say that I am glad that I read the book. It over-reaches itself and leaves a man a better conservative in theology than it found him. It shows how far human reason can wander when left to itself, which is the very point I made about reason in the beginning of this notice. It is a danger which conservatives as well as radicals need to avoid.

Digitized by Google

4. THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT. *By Dr. J. B. Shearer.*

I have had the privilege of reading the advance sheets of Dr. Shearer's exposition of the "Sermon on the Mount." The book is already in type and will probably be published before this notice appears. This book represents the life-time work of a great student and teacher of the Holy Scriptures. I hope that it is going to have a wide circulation both among ministers and laymen. It richly deserves the widest possible circulation. We can never study the "Sermon on the Mount" too much. There are many valuable helps to such a study, and yet there is room for another. I doubt whether all of them put together will take us to the heart of some of the simplest statements of the "Sermon on the Mount." Dr. Shearer gives material that we find in no other book with which I am acquainted. Some of his interpretations are so new they are almost startling. What would the fathers say if they were told by a great student of the Scriptures, and the most conservative man in the church, that the Scriptures teach that both the innocent and the guilty parties in the case of proper divorce may remarry. I want to study that subject further when the book comes out.

WALTER L. LINGLE.

My reading has been in all fields. In early spring, I finished reviewing Zenophon's Memorabilia. Make your own translation, and then compare it with Bohn's Translation. The mind like a razor becomes dull, and I have found this the best possible hone to put an edge on it.

Every man to his own taste in reading is a good rule. One of the most interesting works that has lately fallen into my hands is "The Life and Letters of Huxley." It is by his son. It is largely correspondence with intimate friends on all subjects under the sun, and hitherto unpublished. These letters reveal the inner life of the man. The one thought that impressed me after finishing the two volumes, was the fact how near he came in his thinking to the kingdom of God. His definition of Providence in his Romas lectures at Oxford is wonderful, and raised the cry in the agnostic camp; Huxley has deserted us. If it were not for burdening the space in this magazine, it would be well worth the while to collect his various sayings upon religion and religious subjects. His epitaph selected by himself would surprise many.

I never rush to the stores and libraries for a new book. I wait a while after it is out from the press. And so I read only last winter the life of Dr. Dabney, by Dr. Johnson. I was led to read it by a remark in the interior that it never should have been written, and, if written, never should have been published, and, if published, never should have been read. "Many men of many minds" came to me upon reading it. What a pity every preacher and lover of his country did not study this book. In reading Palmer's "Life of Thornwell," I was unable to decide with whom I was more in love, Thornwell or Palmer. Dr. Johnston has, by some magic, obliterated himself and kept before the reader Dr. Dabney. I do not deny its literary merit, for it is great; but

Digitized by Google

he hides himself, and you see only the subject. My acquaintance with Dr. Dabney was limited, and I looked upon him as an extremist. How mistaken! See his anxiety in prayers and sermons as well as in addresses and printed articles for the country to avert disunion! His moderate position on many Calvinistic points, urging that certain questions in theology ought not to be raised, but postponed for future light. And his intense love of church and country! What singular burying of ambition in declining calls to New York, to a chair in Princeton Theological Seminary—a position that any Presbyterian minister might envy—and his remarkable modesty in all of the church courts. Wonderful man! The King on His Throne as His Ascension Gift to a poor church in the wilderness wandering without a leader, send us many more such and give us grace to follow his leading! Is there not some way of inducing our young men to study this book?

I found untold delight, like a visit to an old-time friend, in the study of Theological Discussions by Dr. Girardeau. The writer was under his tuition for three years when he first entered Columbia Seminary. These views are somewhat enlarged and expanded from the first lectures. There are different shades of Calvinism. Dr. Girardeau was an extreme Federalist. There is in this system: Moral Government Simple; then Modified by Covenant of Works; and, finally, Modified by Covenant of Grace. The centers are the Federal heads—Adam and Jesus Christ. Dr. Girardeau was the theologian of the Covenants. Voetious on Covenants and Hallyburton were his favorites. On the two Adams—persons, natures, stipulations of the Covenants to these heads, representation in them of their posterity; in the former, natural; and in the latter, spiritual; the officials acts of these two heads on their constituency; former, sin, condemnation and spiritual death; latter, obedience in meeting all demands of the Covenants, justification, and spiritual life for all his seed; I say, on these points Dr. Girardeau had no superior, North or South. His is not a system, but only supplies what the system of the theologians have to a great extent omitted or treated not extensively. While he was a superior theologian, still his great reputation will rest on his work in the pulpit; and his masterpieces on this subject are his sermons to the negroes.

At this point, summer caught the writer and he spent it in the shade reading Edgar Allen Poe's works, and Little Masterpieces of Literature by Hamilton W. Mabie. It is not well to confine one's reading to one subject—especially theology. There is danger of cranks in the head. I have found a broad reading will aid a preacher in both pulpit and pastorate. I have read other things, but this is more than enough, I fear, for your space. T. M. L.

Knoxville, Tenn.

Digitized by Google

EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT. *By Rev. D. B. K. Walthall, Ph. D.* Price 10 cents. For sale by the Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 214 North Sixth Street, Richmond, Va.

Dr. Walthall is a thoughtful man; and one of the most scholarly of the younger ministers in our Southern Presbyterian Church. In the pamphlet before us—a very neat phamphlet, by the way, of twenty-six octavo pages—he discusses a theme of vital importance and perpetual interest. In the discussion he, *in the first place*, establishes the truth of the doctrine of everlasting punishment; and *in the second place*, examines into the meaning of the phrase "everlasting punishment.'

The argument under the first head is from reason and Scripture. The arguments from reason are all thought producing, some of them are strong. The argument from the Scriptures ought to be sufficient with all who believe in a true inspiration of those holy writings. Under the second head he raises the questions: "What is the character of everlasting punishment?" "When does this punishment become fixed for the individual?" "Are the descriptions of endless punishment in the Scriptures literal or figurative?" "Are there degrees in punishment?" "What proportion of the human race will experience it?" "What is the purpose of the Scripture in teaching this doctrine?"

While not agreeing with the author in several particular statements, I regard the answers given as able and eminently satisfactory.

We hope that this booklet will meet with such a reception as to encourage Dr. Walthall to give us others. It is our conviction that it should meet with such a reception. The importance of the subject, the suggestiveness and ability of the presentations, its timeliness, severally and together work for this conviction.

THOS. C. JOHNSON.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE
Union Seminary Magazine

VOL. XVIII DECEMBER, 1906—JANUARY, 1907 No. 2

GEORGE BUCHANAN, THE SCOTTISH HUMANIST.

BY PROFESSOR STALKER, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Last year the quater-centenary of John Knox was celebrated amidst demonstrations of interest which not only extended to the remotest parishes of Scotland, but found answering echoes in every corner of the globe. This year is the quater-centenary of another famous Scot—George Buchanan; and the University of St. Andrews, of which he was an alumnus in his youth, and in which he held the distinguished office of Principal of St. Leonard's College in his maturity, issued to the country and the learned world in the beginning of the year an invitation to celebrate the event there in the month of July The occasion was an interesting one, and speeches were delivered by men of eminence, well able to do justice to the subject; but the echoes from other countries, and even in this country, have been few and faint in comparison with those which replied to the summons to commemorate John Knox.

This contrast is not only an illustration of how in the course of centuries reputations may wax or wane, but is also a sign of the times. Once the name of Buchanan stood at least as high as that of Knox in the land of their birth, and was far better known in foreign parts. Indeed, for two centuries after the deaths of both, Buchanan was the more outstanding figure, Dr. Johnson declaring him to be the only man of European reputation whom Scotland had ever produced. But Buchanan's name may be said to have steadily waned from the time when the Latin language ceased to be the medium through which academical instruction was communicated, while John Knox, on the contrary, has, since about the same date, continued to rise

Digitized by Google

steadily both in the esteem of his own countrymen and in the notice of the world. The principal cause of this change has undoubtedly been that, in this period, religion has taken a firmer hold of the minds of men; so that the heroes of religion, such as the Reformers of the sixteenth century, have come to the front among those whom the people delight to remember and to honor. It is quite possible, however, that there may yet be in store for Buchanan a revival of public interest. During the last thirty years the status of the teaching profession has been steadily rising; and, should this movement go on and the office of the educationist become an object of popular worship, there is no name more likely than his to be employed as a figurehead for the new enthusiasm; for, however he may be dwarfed when compared with the most outstanding representatives of religion, he certainly holds a foremost place among the ranks of the teaching profession.

At all events, George Buchanan is well entitled in any seat of learning to the notice suggested by the occurrence of the four hundredth anniversary of his birth; and it is especially interesting to those who were studying the life-story of John Knox last year to lay that of his contemporary alongside of it and mark the resemblances and contrasts. If Knox was born in the traditional year of his birth, 1505, then Buchanan was a year his junior, being unquestionably born in 1506; but he survived him ten years, not dying till 1582, whereas Knox's life terminated in 1572. If the view recently broached with some confidence be correct, that Knox was not born till ten years after the traditional date, then, of course, we must think of Knox's life as enclosed entirely within the limits of Buchanan's, with a considerable margin at either extremity—nine years at the beginning and ten at the end. Both were farmers' sons. While, however, Knox was a native of the Lothians in the East, Buchanan came of the Lennox in the West. Yet, while the East countryman became an alumnus of the University of Glasgow, the West countryman can be claimed by the ancient University of Fife. Both men were destined to spend many years abroad, though in very different capacities and employments. Both returned about the same time to their native country, with a reputation acquired abroad and with an ample experience of

Digitized by Google

the world, both being by this time well over middle life. Yet for both there was still a very important lap of the course to run; Knox having before him more than a dozen of his busiest years, and Buchanan more than a score.

During this last period their fortunes mingled, being sometimes very closely identified indeed; yet, on the whole, the two names stand for different things. John Knox is the Reformer, associated in the memory of the world with Luther, Calvin, Zwingli and Cranmer; George Buchanan is the Humanist, remembered in the same category with Erasmus, Reuchlin and Colet. Humanism, known also in history by such names as the Renaissance and the Revival of Learning, stood in the same relation to the Reformation as the movement of John the Baptist did to that of Jesus Christ; it prepared the way of the Lord. It awakened Europe from the slumber of centuries, convincing its inhabitants of the misery and degradation into which they had allowed themselves to sink under the influence of the Papacy and giving them glimpses of a life of nobleness, freedom and sunshine in the books of classical antiquity. But, as John could only baptize with water, whilst men needed to be baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire, so did the Renaissance lack the power to deliver the nations from the degradation it was able to expose or to realize the new earth of which it was able to prophesy. While some of the humanists, like Zwingli, advanced from being humanists to be true reformers, others became wholly worldly and profane, or went back in their old age to beg a morsel of bread and a sheltering roof from the Church which they had helped to denounce and discredit. Erasmus, the greatest of them all, fell into controversy and enmity with Luther, and at the last was far less favorable to the religious movement than at the first. With Buchanan this was happily not the case: he was nearer to John Knox at the close than at the beginning, and his position in the memory of the religious section of his fellow-countrymen is indicated by the fact that his name has a place in "The Scots Worthies." Still, it is as a humanist that he figures in the history of his country, and in the history of Europe, his name indicating the high-water mark of the Revival of Learning in Scotland in the sixteenth century.

In the earlier portion of his life George Buchanan was a fine

Digitized by Google

specimen of one of the most characteristic types of the age to which he belonged—namely, the Wandering Scholar. At the present day young men in the southern part of the United Kingdom, who are sent by their fathers to Oxford or Cambridge, to live there at the rate of two hundred a year, are completely at a loss to understand how Scottish students can quit their homes at seventeen or eighteen years of age and begin life in a university city nearly, if not entirely, on their own resources, and can in due time complete an academic career without requiring any, or at least any considerable, subsidy from home. But hardly less puzzling to even Scotsmen of the present day is the record which has come down of academic life in pre-reformation times; for at that period students were launched, in the same way, on the world at what we now regard as the helpless age of eleven or twelve. At this age they not only left home, as unprovided as the Scots student usually is now, to attend the native seats of learning, but they even crossed the seas, in the same condition, to attend foreign universities. To the scanty provision they took with them from home they might be able to add some small bursary or free meal or free lodging at the seat of learning; in the neighborhood of such places a chartered liberty to beg for the supply of the most pressing wants was allowed to students; and even habits of pilfering, for the same purpose, seems to have been regarded by the well-to-do citizens with an indulgent eye. Though body and soul could thus be held together, multitudes of these traveling scholars, as they were called, succumbed to their privations or received in their constitutions the seeds of disease which shortened their days. In many places the oversight of the authorities was lax and fitful; the older students tyrannized unmercifully over the younger; the lives of many became wild and wasted; and there was a large class of hangers-on, who remained students all their days, subsisting on such crumbs and scraps as fell from the general table, or on what they could earn by odd jobs of a miscellaneous description. Yet the great majority appear to have emerged without much harm from the trying ordeal and, equipped with the best knowledge afforded by the age, struck into the various paths of honorable endeavor, while a select few were retained in the seat of learning to be the instructors of the coming generations of students.

Digitized by Google

Such was the life into which George Buchanan was plunged when he was no more than thirteen years of age. He was born at Killearn, in Stirlingshire, half way between Glasgow and Loch Katrine, of parents who, though poor, preserved traditions of gentility, which stimulated aspiration, this taking the form, as it has done in Scotland so often, of a passion for learning. The death of the father, indeed, when George was but seven years of age, seemed to shut the door of hope, but an uncle, a brother of his mother, came to the rescue, and it was decreed that George should be sent not only to the university, but to the greatest university of the age—that of Paris—which is said to have had at the time no fewer than twenty thousand students, distributed among fifty colleges. There were already, indeed, three Scotch universities in existence—at St. Andrews, Aberdeen and Glasgow—but as yet these were possessed of a very feeble vitality, both as regards educational resources and number of students, and Glasgow especially, the most eligible, it might have been supposed, for one living so near, was in a pitiable state of destitution. In Paris, on the contrary, there had been a Scots college for two hundred years, to which young Scotsmen athirst for knowledge flocked, the number of freshmen in the year when Buchanan entered it being no less than seventy-six.

For the Scots boy it must have been a bewildering experience to be transported to this foreign city and plunged into this seething element of student-life, composed of all nationalities. But he soon found his bearings, and he was abler than most to battle with the difficulties of any situation. Unhappily, the good uncle Heriot died after a couple of years; and George had to return to his widowed mother, now living at Cardross, not far from the place of his birth. For two years it seemed as if his career were ended; but then—we know not through what favorable turn of the domestic fortunes—he made out to go to St. Andrews and complete his interrupted course. Not only so, but he was able soon afterwards to return to Paris, where, in 1528, at the age of two-and-twenty, he obtained his degree of Master of Arts. Thereupon he found employment as a regent, or assistant-professor, at the College of St. Barbe, in that city; and that he quickly made his mark may be inferred from the fact that he was soon elected to the office of Procurator of the German

Digitized by Google

Nation—one of the four sections into which the whole body of the students was divided.

St. Barbe, which happened to be the *alma mater* of two such opposite celebrities of that age as John Calvin and Ignatius Loyola, was a Portuguese college; and one of Buchanan's fellow-regents in it, on receiving an invitation to become rector of a seat of learning at Bordeaux, invited the Scotsman to accept a mastership there under him. The offer was accepted; and among his pupils at Bordeaux Buchanan had Michael Montaigne, destined to achieve immortality through his "essays." The head of the institution, being subsequently instructed by the King of Portugal to form a seat of learning at Coimbra in that country, again extended an invitation to Buchanan to accompany him; and not in vain. But this turned out an unlucky adventure, for the Jesuits, having succeeded in securing the institution for themselves, Buchanan was not only dismissed but imprisoned, or at least detained in a monastery. He soon, however, escaped and found other employment.

In that age persons in the condition of Buchanan varied their academic appointments with intervals of private tutoring; and Buchanan held, at different times, several posts of this description, being for some years tutor to a son of the Earl of Cassilis, an Ayrshire nobleman, and subsequently acting in the same capacity to a natural son of James the Fifth, and thus being brought into connection with the Scottish Court. His longest engagement of this kind was in the family of the Count de Brissac, a French notability of the time, whose martial occupations carried not only himself, but his son and his tutor into the romantic land of Italy.

It is remarkable how many Scotsmen in that age passed through an existence not unlike this of Buchanan. There was hardly a university or high school in France which had not a Scotsman among its teachers; and still more numerous were the Scots who were wandering over the Continent in the train of persons of quality as tutors or secretaries. The prevalence of Latin as the universal language of learned intercourse made easy the transition from one country to another; though, of course, Buchanan, through his long residence in France and Portugal, became an expert in the use of the tongues of these

Digitized by Google

countries. Paris, however, was, in those years, the centre to which he always returned from his engagements, and in which he could always find employment when he needed it. Sometimes he spoke of the place as a treadmill, in which he had to toil like a slave in conflict with stupid and unruly boys; but, in happier moods, he was wont to celebrate the city as the mistress of his heart, to which his affections always turned when set free from more distant objects. Nevertheless, ample evidence could be adduced to prove that, all this time, he had not forgotten his native country, which, in an address written on the occasion of Mary Stuart's marriage to the King of France, he described as a land whose sons—

> count all gone, if honour's gone;
> Whose faith can ne'er be bought or sold;
> Who deem a friend Heaven's dearest boon;
> Who barter not their soul for gold.

During the many years in which, as a wandering scholar, Buchanan was earning his living in the manner described, he was gradually rising to a commanding position in another line—that of a Man of Letters. At that period there was in the air a strong tendency towards literary production; it was part of the Humanistic movement. Those who had unearthed the glorious monuments of Greek and Roman literature were passionately ambitious of imitating and, if it might be, rivalling those models of antiquity. Especially was the fame of poetic production an object of ambition, the members of the Humanistic clubs in the academic centres being known to one another by the name of poets.

This was the line in which George Buchanan aspired to excel, and so successful was he that in subsequent generations his writings were published under the title, "Georgii Buchani Scoti, Poetarum sui Saeculi Facile Principis, Opera Omnia."

His first efforts were satires—this being a form to which the Scottish mind is prone; and religious satires—this being demanded by the contemptible state of religion at the time. He pretends that St. Francis appearing to him in a dream asked him to become a friar of his order. He refused, giving reasons; and this opens the way for exposing the evil practices of the

Digitized by Google

friars at the time, as he does in no restrained manner. To King James, who happened to see the first of these productions, the humor was so acceptable that he pressed the young poet to write more; but to the clergy, with Cardinal Beatoun at their head, it was so obnoxious that Buchanan found himself in prison, out of which when he managed to escape, he prudently fled the country. But in Paris, on his arrival, he found Cardinal Beatoun there before him, and this seems to have facilitated his acceptance of the appointment at Bordeaux, of which mention has already been made.

In the High School there it was a practice of the boys to perform plays; and this circumstance led to Buchanan trying his hand at the dramatic species of composition. He not only translated two plays of Euripides—the "Medea" and the "Alcestis"—but composed two dramas of his own, entitled, respectively, "Jephthes, sive Votum," and "Baptistes, sive Calumnia." These are sacred dramas, founded on the Bible stories of Jephthah and John the Baptist. They recall the miracle-plays of the Middle Ages, but are like the dramas on similar subjects by the French dramatists of the age of Louis XIV.; the most consummate effort of the same species being, however, the "Samson Agonistes" of Milton. Of these four plays, the most noteworthy is the "Baptistes," because in it appear the first indications of the strong and liberal opinions on political subjects of which the author was subsequently to be a champion.

It has been already mentioned that, at a later period, he was deprived of an appointment in Portugal and shut up there in a monastery. The hours of this imprisonment he beguiled by turning into verse the Psalms of David. And this was to prove by far the most popular and lasting of his poetical efforts. Perhaps, indeed, it may still be spoken of as in the land of the living. At all events, within living memory it was used as a class-book by the renowned Melvin in the Grammar School of Aberdeen; and up and down the country there are probably gentlemen yet whose classical studies are represented by the presence, side by side on their desks, of Horace's "Odes" and Buchanan's "Psalms." The interpreter of the Psalms will do well to glance frequently into Buchanan; for the translation is really a commentary, and an excellent though a succint one; the author

Digitized by Google

grappling with difficulties and always bringing out a meaning, though not always the correct one.

This Psalter is in a great variety of metres; and a glance through the works of the poet will show how fruitful he was in the lyrical species, producing songs of love, descriptions of natural scenery, epistles to friends, odes on public occasions, and the like, in remarkable profusion.

But all the time he was traveling with a great theme, which was to be his "magnum opus," though, alas! like many other ambitious efforts of the same sort, it never came to full fruition. More than half of it, however, was completed, and the torso extends to many hundreds of lines. The title is "De Sphaera," the sphere intended being the earth, considered as an astronomical body, and the whole forming an exposition of the elements of which the globe is composed and of the influences exerted on it by the heavenly bodies. This recalls the grand theme of Milton's masterpiece, as well as that of Thomson's "Seasons," but Buchanan not only believes that the earth is central in the universe and stationary, but ridicules the opposite opinion, then coming into vogue, as a foolish and monstrous novelty. This, of course, is fatal.

Far more fatal, however, than scientific conservatism to Buchanan's reputation as a poet was his adhesion to Latin as the language in which he wrote. He seems to have really believed that this would always be the language of literature, the vulgar tongues being reserved for the commoner uses of life. Dante before him had had the same problem to face and hesitated, but finally decided it in accordance with the course of human progress. Milton even, long after him, hesitated, but he also happily came to the right conclusion. Buchanan mistook the road; but it must be remembered that he was living abroad, where poems written in the Scots language would have had no audience, whereas those written in Latin had for audience all the universities of Europe. By this audience he was classed with the very foremost practitioners of the poetic art. Perhaps the standard of criticism by which he was tried was not the right one: it went more upon form than substance. Yet, tried by the latter test, Buchanan will not be stripped of the laurel. Before him there was in Scotland one poet of real greatness, William Dunbar.

Digitized by Google

His own contemporary, Sir David Lindsay, is also one of the mighties. Both of these have been far outstripped by the genius of Robert Burns. But it is among such "dii majores" that George Buchanan's place is to be found; and the ore of poetry in his compositions is genuine enough to make it worth seeking by those in search of this kind of treasure, even under the covering of a foreign language.

In his fifty-fifth or fifty-sixth year Buchanan returned to his native land after the many vicissitudes of the wandering scholar which has been described without ever having found any permanent employment worthy of his talents or having picked up any provision for old age more substantial than the glory of a man of letters. He had reached the stage when many of the Humanists, as has been already remarked, slipped back into the shelter of the Church; and, if he was not prepared to brook such a surrender, the prospect before him could not be considered very bright. In point of fact, however, there were yet in store for him twenty years and more of full and exciting life in a new character—that of a Man of Action.

Mary Stuart, having left behind her in France a buried husband, had come home, the year before, to reign over her native land as Queen of Scots, and Buchanan, immediately on his arrival, it would appear, obtained employment in the court as secretary or reader to the Queen, she translating Livy and other ancient authors under his direction, and he putting at her disposal his stores of knowledge. With a pupil marked by so keen a curiosity and a master possessed of so wide an experience, there must have been plenty of interruptions in the stated tasks; Mary must have enjoyed the conversation of one who could talk of France and Paris with an enthusiasm equal to her own; and Buchanan cannot but have been charmed with her society and that of her fair Maries, to whom, in intervals of leisure, he indited odes of mock devotion; among his works there are such to Mary Beatoun and Mary Flefing. Nor did the Queen fail to repay the services she received, for he was endowed with the income of the Abbey of Crossraguel.

But, when the Queen, after her marriage with Darnley, began to deviate from the path of wisdom, and especially when, after

Digitized by Google

the death of Darnley, she, within three months, married his reputed murderer, Buchanan went over to the opposite faction, which deposed Mary and set upon the throne her infant son, James the Sixth; and to this party he adhered for the rest of his life. The Regent Moray, the first head of the party, created him Principal of St. Leonard's College at St. Andrews; and, under subsequent Regents, we find him filling the offices of Director of Chancery and Keeper of the Privy Seal, with a seat in Parliament. By the apologists of Mary he has been denounced for deserting his benefactress and going over to the side of her enemies; but to this there is one conclusive answer: he believed her guilty.

At first he appears to have stood to the Regent Moray's Government in a relation not unlike that in which Milton stood to the Government of Cromwell. Thus, he accompanied Moray and the other Scots commissioners to York, to lay the crimes of Mary before the commissioners of Queen Elizabeth; and he embodied the accusations in a powerful paper, in Latin, entitled the "Detectio," which flew all over Europe and convinced many persons in authority of Mary's guilt, while it made the public aware of the precise nature of the charges brought against her. It is not the subtle brief of a lawyer, but a downright narrative of events, this being, alas! by far the most formidable weapon which could be employed against the unfortunate Queen.

As has been hinted, the party opposed to Mary had crowned her infant son in her place; and now they had the royal infant in their charge. As the prince grew towards boyhood, his education was felt to be a public concern of no mean importance; and they showed their appreciation of Buchanan by committing the charge to him. In order to fulfil its duties, he had to resign his principalship; and, for the rest of his days, he was wherever the prince was. Two or three scions of the nobility shared the instruction; and Buchanan had an assistant; but not only did his employers and his old friends in foreign lands look upon the appointment as one of distinguished honor as well as high responsibility, but Buchanan himself took his office seriously. In the tender years of his pupil he did not spare the rod; and for his maturer mind he penned his treatise, "De Jure Regni apud Scotos," which was intended to expound and enforce the princi-

Digitized by Google

ples of constitutional government, instructing the King to rule in submission to the law and to keep the welfare of his subjects before his eyes as his highest end, next to the glory of God. It is well known that King James became, in his maturity, the champion of the opposite doctrines—of the divine right of kings and the passive obedience of subjects—so that the efforts of his tutor may be said to have failed. To what this failure was due it may be hard to say. Perhaps the master was too insistent; perhaps the soil on which he was sowing was stony ground. In subsequent days the monarch used to boast of having had for his teacher the finest scholar in Europe; it gave him extra confidence in his own wisdom and infallibility. But, if Buchanan's lessons were forgotten by his pupil, the treatise, just named, in which these were embodied was not forgotten by his fellow-countrymen: it was the progenitor of Samuel Rutherford's "Lex Rex," and many another defence of civil liberty; and it may be said to this day to supply an element of iron to the political blood of Scotland.

One more great service Buchanan had still to render to the party with which he was associated; and this was to write the history of their proceedings, as he did in his "Rerum Scoticarum Historia." In this work, it is true, in accordance with the custom of the time, he wasted many laborious pages on early portions of the history of his country of which he knew nothing. But, when he came to the events of which he had been an eyewitness, he unfolded the most sterling qualities of an historian, and produced a narrative which is among our most priceless historic monuments. A still more remarkable history of the same period was contributed by the pen of John Knox; and, by putting both together, we are able to obtain a singularly accurate and perfect image of the most momentous age in Scottish annals.

It remains to say something about Buchanan's character as a man and about his religion.

In his early poetry there is a grossness which makes a very unpleasant impression. It has been usual to excuse it on the plea that it was the custom of the age, the poets indulging in erotic effusions which were mere exercises on their instrument without any necessary connection with experience; but it must

Digitized by Google

remain exceedingly doubtful how far, in the Bohemian existence of the Latin Quarter of Paris, Buchanan remembered the puritanical ideals of his home. In his earliest poetic efforts he vigorously lashed the licentiousness of the monks; but it has never been a rare thing to see a satirist enslaved to the very vices which his pen is denouncing. In Paris he early became associated with the Lutherans, as the adherents of the doctrines of the Reformation were at first called there, but neither can this be taken as a certain sign of his condition; because sympathy with doctrinal novelties may be purely speculative.

There has recently been fresh light cast on an episode in Buchanan's middle life which renders it undesirable, in his own interest, to assume him to have been, before that point, a decided professor of the reformed faith. It has been already mentioned that, in 1550, in company with two others, he was evicted from the high school in which he was teaching at Coimbra, in Portugal, and shut up for a time in a monastery by the Jesuits. Thus much has always been known of an incident over which he passes in gingerly fashion in his autobiography. But, on closer knowledge, it proves to be of remarkable significance. In 1834 the building of the Inquisition at Lisbon having been razed to the ground, because the infamous institution had at last perished, there were carted from it and transferred to the National Archives huge masses of documents, over which archæologists and historians have since, from time to time, been working. Not a few valuable finds have been thereby unearthed, but certainly the most interesting of these has been a bundle of documents, amounting to nearly fifty pages in all, connected with the process against Buchanan.

From this source it is now known that, from motives of personal vengeance, he and two of his fellow-professors were denounced to the Inquisition in 1549. Against them evidence was secretly accumulated, till a *prima facie* case having been made out, they were arrested at Coimbra and transferred to the prison of the Inquisition at Lisbon on 15th of August, 1550. For about a year the legal proceedings pursued their tedious course, examination succeeding examination, and Buchanan on two occasions handing in defences, which have been preserved, and consist of no fewer than fourteen pages, written in his clear and

Digitized by Google

delicate caligraphy. Therein he makes confession of certain peccadilloes, such as eating meat on forbidden days, and acknowledges that, in earlier life, he had entertained doubts about certain doctrines of the faith; but he had been better instructed by one of his judges; and he was now ready to give pledges of orthodoxy for the future. Evidently these retractations were considered satisfactory, for in July, 1551, he was released from the place of danger, being sentenced to abjure his errors and to be confined meantime in a monastery, where a pious task would be prescribed to him for the good of his soul. This was nothing else than the translation into Latin of the Book of Psalms, so that Buchanan's famous masterpiece had an origin almost ludicrous. The custody of the prisoner having, it appears, proved burdensome to the monastery, he was in no long time set at liberty, when he hastened to put the breadth of the sea between him and the Inquisition.

If Buchanan had before this been a decided and open professor of the new opinions, this would have been a lapse fatal to his reputation, and in its emergence into light so long after it took place there is something of the day of judgment. But the fact seems to be that as yet he had made no very open profession, and perhaps had had no experiences and convictions for which it would have been incumbent on him to face the worst.

In the interval, however, of ten years between this incident and his final return to his native country, in 1551, he made a fresh and independent study of the Bible, from which his religious views received quickening and deepening; and, on his return home, events threw him into association with the religious party there. It was remarked of him by one who knew him well that he readily took the color of the company in which he was familiar; and his may have been one of those natures in which religious conviction require for its maturity a warm and stimulating environment. He was soon elected an elder of the Church, and in this capacity he sat in the earliest meetings of the General Assembly. Of this body, in 1567, he was actually Moderator; this office not being then restricted to ministers. Indeed, in the great scarcity of ministers, various functions were then readily entrusted to elders, which custom subsequently looked upon as exclusively clerical; and there is no reason to doubt a rumor that Buchanan sometimes preached.

Digitized by Google

Of his old age there has come down to us a picture too characteristic to be omitted in any sketch of his life, however brief—a perfect gem of biography from the same pen as that to which we are indebted for an even more priceless picture of the old age of Knox. "That September (1581) in times of vacans," says James Melville, the diarist, "my uncle, Mr. Andro" (that is, the renowned Andrew Melville), "Mr. Thomas Buchanan and I heiring that Mr. George Buchanan was weak, and his historie under the pres, passed ower to Edinbruche annes errand (on purpose) to visit him and sie the wark. When we cam to his chalmer, we fande him sitting in his chaire, tetching his young man, that servit him in his chalmer, to spell a b ab, e b eb, etc. Efter salutation Mr. Andro says—'I sie, sir, ye are nocht ydle.' 'Better this,' quoth he, 'than stealing sheipe or sitting ydle, whilk is as ill.' Therefter he schew us the Epistle Dedicatorie to the King; the quilk, when Mr. Andro had read, he tauld him that it was obscure in sum places and wanted certean words to perfyt the sentence (sense?). Sayes he, 'I may do na mair for thinking of another mater.' 'What is that?' says Mr. Andro. 'To die,' quoth he, 'but I leve that and many mo things for you to helpe.' We went from him to the printars wark house, whom we fand at the end of the 17th buik of his Cronicle, at a place which we thought verie hard for the tyme, quhilk might be the occasion of steying of the haill wark, anent the buriall of Davie (David Rizzio). Therefor, steying the printar from proceiding, we cam to Mr. George again and fund him bedfast by (contrary to) his costome and asking him how he did, 'Even the way of weilfare,' sayes he. Mr. Thomas, his cusing, schawes him of the hardnes of that part of his storie, that the King wald be offendit with it, and it might stey all the wark. 'Tell me, man,' seyes he, 'giff (whether) I have tauld the treuthe?' 'Yis,' sayes Mr. Thomas, 'Sir, I think so.' 'I will byd his fead (feud) and all his kins then,' quoth he—'Pray, pray to God for me, and let Him direct all.' Sa, he (by the time) the printing of his Cronicle was endit, that maist lerned, wyse and godly man endit this his mortall lyf."

In this incident we see the man—sturdy, truth-loving, defiant, with plenty of what Burns calls "the stalk of carle-hemp" in his composition. By a contemporary he is called "a Stoic philoso-

Digitized by Google

pher, who looked not far before him." In spite of his cosmopolitan training, there adhered to his manners a dash of rusticity, together with a notable slovenliness in dress. His conversation was always seasoned, and not infrequently over-seasoned, with the salt of humor. But it is to be observed how heartily James Melville—an excellent witness on such a point—speaks of his religious character. In another passage, the same authority describes him as one of "the three best friends of Christ" in Scotland, the other two being "the Good Regent" and John Knox. And Calderwood informs us that, having died on 28th September, 1582, he was followed to his grave, in the Greyfriars Churchyard, by "a great company of the faithful."

Perhaps partiality has led us to sketch this portrait too smoothly, without the roughnesses which made Buchanan an original. Of these there were enough and to spare. But he outgrew his coarser and profaner self; his was a day which was most glorious towards the setting of the sun. As he grew older, he became more and more decidedly Christian; and thus he illustrated in his own person, as well as in his association with John Knox, that blending of Humanism with Protestantism—that is, of learning with piety, of culture with religion—which may still be said to be the ideal of his native country.

Digitized by Google

EUREKA, AN ESSAY ON THE MATERIAL AND SPIRITUAL UNIVERSE, BY EDGAR ALLEN POE.

By Rev. C. R. Vaughan, D. D.

"What I here propound is true; therefore it cannot die; or if by any means it be now trodden down so that it die, it will rise again to the Life Everlasting."

"Nevertheless, it is as a poem only that I wish this work to be judged after I am dead."

By many of the contemporary and subsequent admirers of Mr. Poe, this singular speculation has been construed as the highest product of his genius. It is certainly distinguished by the display of his extraordinary powers of analysis—by remarkable exhibitions of his scientific attainments—by the boldness of his departures from the recognized doctrines of mankind—by the subtlety and ingenuity of his reasonings—by the simplicity and energy of his style—by the vast sweep of his imaginative grasp upon the most remote and extended phenomena of the universe—and by the unfaltering boldness with which he asserts his ultimate conclusion—the final indentification of every conscious being with Jehovah, without loss of consciousness. The conclusion finally affirmed is Pantheism, although, for a time, he seems to waver between Pantheism and Polytheism; but a Pantheism differing from that of the German Pantheists, who postulates the burial of all individual consciousness by the evolution into deity. With a humility, which he protests is unassumed, and is eminently becoming in an adventurer into a region so high, difficult and mysterious, the gifted author proceeds to develop his views, with an independence not deformed by a censurable insolence of assertion, and not conspicuously wanting in the humility with which he professes to set out. In the interest of a true religion and a sound philosophy—a religion adapted to the conscious nature and wants of the human race as it actually exists—a philosophy based upon the facts of the status and history of the present scene of human life, we propose to analyze and test the positions assumed in this remarkable speculation.

Digitized by Google

With the highest appreciation of this extraordinary genius, and a wondering admiration for this unique and Gothic structure—we shall apply the testing tap of investigation to its main positions and endeavor to give an impartial account of its remarkable features—the brilliancy of its imaginative qualities, the boldness of its speculative theories, the ingenuity of its reasoning, and the fatal error of its final conclusions.

"I design to speak," says the author, "of the physical, metaphysical, mathematical—of the material and spiritual universe—of its essence, its origin, its creation, its present condition, and its destiny. I shall be so rash, moreover, as to challenge the conclusions, and thus, in effect, to question the sagacity of many of the greatest and most justly reverenced of men." "In the beginning, let us as distinctly as possible, announce—not the theorem which I hope to demonstrate—for whatever the mathematicians may assert, there is, in this world at least, no such thing as demonstration—but the ruling idea which, throughout this volume, I shall be continually endeavoring to suggest."

"My general proposition, then, is this: In the original unity of the first thing lies the secondary cause of all things, with the germ of their inevitable annihilation."

1. The author starts on his adventurous expedition, by making more than one definition, although he expresses a somewhat discreditable opinion of "definitions." He pronounces definitions, both in mathematics and in metaphysics, as pure "assumptions;" but is compelled to begin his speculation with a similar "assumption"—claiming that his assumption will be vindicated hereafter by the consistency of its content. He defines the universe to be: "The utmost conceivable expanse of space, with all things, spiritual and material, that can be imagined to exist within the compass of that expanse." He discriminates the material creation as distinguished from "the utmost conceivable expanse of space" beyond it—including all worlds—as "the universe of stars." This definition is faulty, inasmuch as it limits the universe to the "expanse" as "conceivable." In point of fact, the universe of space as distinguished from the "universe of stars" is "inconceivable" because it is literally "infinite." It extends far beyond the point where the power of conception

Digitized by Google

breaks down under the weight of the notion with which it is struggling. Space is necessarily without bounds; but the content of space—excluding the one concept of God—is necessarily limited. Embrace the very uttermost of space—by whatever successive aggregations of extension the mind is capable of forming—it is impossible to annihilate the conception of yet other space beyond the line where the mind has been compelled to pause. It stretches around, above, beneath—with ever-expanding reach into absolute infinity! The Infinite God only can fill immensity. The universe of stars is necessarily limited. Matter in all its forms and varieties is necessarily limited; form or figure is one of its essential characteristics; it cannot exist under bounds. Whether it exists as embodied in formed worlds, as star dust, as chaos, or under whatever attenuation it may be thought, matter cannot escape its essential qualities. Figure or form is one of them. In a subsequent part of his treatise, Mr. Poe asserts: "We are fully justified in assuming that matter exists only as attraction and repulsion—that attraction and repulsion are matter, there being no conceivable case in which we may not employ the term "matter," and the terms "attraction and repulsion" taken together as equivalent, and therefore convertible expressions in logic." But, with all deference, it is assuredly true that the great bulk of the students of these mysteries of nature are fully convinced that attraction and repulsion are qualities resident in matter and distinguishable from the substratum in which they reside. Mr. Poe himself distinctly and repeatedly recognizes the existence of "atoms" in matter; what is the relation of these atoms to attraction and repulsion? If attraction and repulsion are all that is in matter, is not the postulation of the atoms superfluous? But if the atoms are a part of the constitution of matter, it is obviously a mistake to make attraction and repulsion alone the constituents of matter. Moreover, attraction and repulsion are invisible forces; no one has ever seen gravity; and the fact that electricity is sometimes visible seems to intimate that repulsion which is as invisible as attraction is rather an effect than a constituent of electricity. Moreover, attraction and repulsion are in themselves invisible forces; but matter is cognizable by the senses in vast multitudes of the forms in which it appears. Yet, further, attraction exists

Digitized by Google

in two forms in the loadstone; it exists as gravity, producing weight, which it possesses in common with all matter; it also exists as a peculiar attraction with a limited adjustment which is not possessed by all matter. Attraction, then, is not the same thing in all matter; it is therefore more justly described as a quality of matter and a variable quality of matter, than as matter itself when associated with repulsion. It seems, then, too, that matter has a number of qualities besides attraction and repulsion, some of which may be due to the two qualities claimed to be the exclusive constituents of matter, but others which have no assignable relation to them. Figure, size, density, tenuity, impenetrability, variety of composition, color and chemical qualities are all qualities of matter—several of which may be due to the action of attraction and repulsion, and some which are due to other causations. It is clearly impossible to limit the conception of matter merely to the single or dual postulate of attraction and repulsion. The atoms must be allowed for at least; and it is hard to discredit other qualities of the mysterious entity called matter.

It is then, an inevitable inference from the essential quality of form or figure in matter, that beyond the necessarily limited sphere and range of the material creation, there is an infinity of space, in which the immensity and omnipresence of God finds its habitat, and where no other existence or being can ever be found. In the after part of his wonderful speculation, Mr. Poe seems to limit God to the "manifestations of the universe"—each universe being adjusted to its own particular God. He thus appears to impeach the immensity of a necessitated being, as not extending beyond these manifestations. In this he seems to coincide with certain theologians, who, distinguishing between the immensity and the omnipresence of God, limit his presence to the actual material and visible creation. But this notion is plainly contradictory. Wherever the immensity of God carries him, he is present. There is no possible divorce between the immensity and the omnipresence of the infinite God. It is equally futile—it is only a scientific expression of the same error—to limit him to the manifestations of the universe, and to exclude him from the infinite of space beyond. God is a necessary being; he is not a caused existence; "he only hath im-

Digitized by Google

mortality!" Whatever cannot but be, in this naked sense of an absolute necessity, cannot be in one space more than another. He exists along with the manifested universe or universes, if you please to postulate them in myriads; but he exists far—far beyond them—filling all those realms of the infinite in space, where no wing of adventurous angel has ever or will ever beat the dusky and awful void—where no impertinence of a creation will ever disturb the holy silences of God's infinite and self-sufficing repose.

2. He then proceeds to explain the method of his proposed investigation. He first discounts the value and discards the use of both the inductive and deductive methods, under the odd names of hog and ram, by which he designates Bacon and Aristotle. He also denies the validity of any reasoning and any conclusion based upon axioms. In the place of these three discarded modes of investigation, he deliberately postulates "imagination" as a trustworthy organ of discovery. Inasmuch as it has occasionally happened that a happy hypothesis has led the way to results, the imagination is accepted as a more reliable mode of discovery and progress in knowledge than the "crawling" and slow advances of induction," or the uncertified content of the undemonstrated general propositions of the deductive method. "Science advances by leaps." The infirmity of this view is that the leaps which accomplish so much are generally, if not invariably, suggested in the course or by the outcome of previous processes of investigation under either or both of the discredited Baconian and Aristotelian methods. In a subsequent part of his treatise, intuition instead of being accepted according to the usual view, both of the masses of mankind and the philosophers also, as a direct perceptive energy of the human understanding, is held to be the outcome of forgotten processes of induction or deduction. If so, these discredited methods do have something to do with the leaps which are so effective in the advancement of science. The appeal for the unriddling of the mystery of the universe is then made to the "imagination," which it is supposed has been sufficiently vindicated as an "organ of discovery." The author, by his appeal to imagination, developes as his point of departure, what he calls an "assumption;" but an assumption which he proposes to transmute into a demonstrated proposition,

Digitized by Google

(although there is no such thing as demonstration in this world in spite of the mathematicians) "by the consistency of its content." (Eureka p. 135.) His own words are: "This will be found the sole absolute assumption of my discourse. I use the words 'assumption' in its ordinary sense; yet I maintain that even this, my primary proposition, is very, very far indeed from being really a mere assumption. Nothing was ever more certainly—no human conclusion was ever in fact, more regularly, more rigorously deduced; but alas! the processes lie out of the human analysis—at all events are beyond the utterance of the human tongue." Now certainly this reveals a most unreliable basis for a grand speculation, ending in the most astounding practical conclusion! An avowed assumption—dictated by the imagination of a most superior imaginative genius, strictly deduced, yet all the processes of the deduction lying out of human analysis, and impossible of delineation in human words! Is it possible to conceive that any enterprise of philosophical speculation could present more unmanageable conditions surrounding its fundamental postulate? But the gifted author is not discouraged; he relies with heroic confidence upon the demonstrative force which resides in the content and consistency of the thought expressed in the "sole assumption" which is laid down as the basis of the grand theory which is to explain the secret of the universe. This confidence, in a basal "assumption," is in accordance with the modern doctrine of an *a priori* argument—the logic involved in developing the content of a notion. In this way the trustworthiness of an axiom which is not demonstrable by any external process may be illustrated. The notion that a whole is equal to the sum of all its parts, and that things which are equal to the same thing, are equal to each other, are samples of the trustworthiness of an argument from the analysis of the content of the notion. But is not this method of sustaining his "sole assumption" an appeal to that axiomatic method which the author has discredited? There is nothing exceptionable in the logical method of the writer simply considered. But the application of this method to the large and infinitely complicated problem of the universe may be questioned. The consistency of developments on such a scale will be difficult, if not impossible, to trace out to the satisfaction of an inquirer. Available with

Digitized by Google

a simple primary axiom, it does not commend itself as competent to the larger enterprise. History informs us that Mrs. Partington was honorably equal to a puddle; but that she overtaxed herself when she meddled with the Atlantic in a tempest. As a final objection, a "deduced axiom" is altogether abnormal. His impeachment of the axiom follows his impeachment of hog and ram, but with no more success. He has found himself obliged to appeal to both. Imagination has not been able to dispense with the necessary implements of the reason. The attack on the authority of the axiom pronounces them to be "mere assumptions." Their discredit proceeds on the fact that some former aphorisms which once had the authority of axioms, have been found to be untrue. But it is unsound reasoning to infer that because some recognized axioms have justly lost that character, all axioms have lost it, and all axiomatic truth has been discredited. Some formal conclusions from inductive and deductive reasoning have also been subsequently discredited; but this fact does not discredit all such conclusions. It is indisputable that some truths are seen to be true, not through an induction of facts, or a deduction of reasoning, but simply by the native power to "see" which belongs to the mind by its original endowment as a "seeing" instrument. That a whole is greater than any one of its parts is seen to be true, and universally true, as soon as the terms of the proposition are understood. Although Mr. Poe pronounces axioms to be unwarranted "assumptions," and as such, unreliable bases for trustworthy reasoning—in another place he uses this language: "To demand why they are true, would be to demand why the axioms are true upon which their demonstration is based." It seems, then, that demonstration is possible in this world, and that the axiom needs no proof beyond the apprehension of the axiom itself. Glancing backward at his previous discredit of "demonstration and axioms" Mr. Poe says: "Nothing is demonstrable, strictly speaking; but if anything be, then the properties—the laws in question—are demonstrated." It seems as if Mr. Poe could not entirely emancipate himself from the delusion or the predujice of mankind in general, that axioms are something more than "unwarranted assumptions." It is not possible to escape the conviction that they are what has been called "primitive truths," not more capable of

Digitized by Google

demonstration by a process of logic than the color or the perfume of a rose, yet as hopeless of rejection by any sane intellect from its faith.

3. Another preliminary exposition of "infinity" is then made, or rather discloses the confusion with which the notion lies in his mind. He pronounces it "the merest of words;" it is not the expression of an idea, but of an effort at one. He evidently confounds the impossibility of a formal and distinct conception of "infinity" with the bare thought or intuitive apprehension of it. The comprehensive conception of it is impossible to finite or limited faculties; the intuition of the notion or the fact of "infinity" is plain enough. How else did the notion of it ever enter the human mind and become the subject of its reasonings? The intuition that there is such a thing as "life" in its manifold forms and varieties is level to the apprehension of a child; the formal conception of what "life" is, in any of its varieties, is beyond all human faculty. Life can only be defined as the condition of strength, beauty, action, suffering, growth, fruitfulness and enjoyment. In itself it is an impenetrable mystery. It is one of those primitive truths or notions which are apprehensible by a native power of intuition, not a notion comprehended under other forms of truth, and deducible from them. This class of truths is what is called by Sir William Hamilton "incomprehensible"—not because they are not apprehensible by the human understanding, but because they are not comprehended under any other form of truth, and as such, deducible from them. As "primitive" they are not susceptible of deduction; they are seen only by intuition. Yet no human being who is not fatuous ever fails to see them. The notion of "infinity" is disclosed by the necessary contrast with the finity or limitation of things, and apprehended by intuition as necessarily true. The notion does not rise as Mr. Poe supposes and as expressed by some mistaken speculators, as rising from the "difficulty" in framing a conception of "a limit." The distinguished author shrewdly comments on this solution of the origin of the notion of "infinity," and seriously impairs its credit. But his impeachment of the solution amounts to nothing because the solution itself is incompetent. The barrier is not a difficulty, but an impossibility; no limit or want of limit can be fixed by any power

Digitized by Google

of definitive conception. It is to be thought—not conceived. The notion of infinity is enforced by the necessary logical opposition or contrast with the familiar notion of the finite, just as the notion of the less enforces the notion of the greater; they are intrinsic correlates. In a manner equally incompetent, Mr. Poe discredits the notion of infinity by an equally incompetent notion of first cause. He so defines "first cause" as to make it equally demonstrative of finity as of infinity. He asks: "What is first cause?" He answers: "An ultimate termination of causes."

By this definition he asserts the notion of limitation in the terms of the definition, and then proceeds to work out the absurdity with which he set out to discredit the plea for an infinite first cause. He then goes on to ask: "And what is an ultimate termination of causes?" Finity—the finite. Thus the one quibble in two processes, by God knows how many philosophers, is made to support now finity, and now infinity. He scornfully asks: "Could it not be brought to support something besides?" As for the quibbles, they at least are insupportable. But to dismiss them; what they prove in the one case is the identical nothing which they demonstrate in the other. Thus the notion of infinity is supposed to be fatally dissevered from the conception of first cause. Very shrewdly inferred indeed, if Mr. Poe is allowed to frame his definition of first cause just to suit his purpose. But when he defines first cause with an intrinsic limitation in the bosom of the definition, there can be no wonder he brings out a finity from the definition which is intended to warrant the opposite inference; and as the argument is made to prove both finity and infinity, it is discredited as worthless. But, unfortunately, first cause is not the "termination of causes;" it is the beginning of causes; it is proved to be the beginning, and not the termination, of causes by its very nature as *first*. His notion of first cause is the datum of the monstrous absurdity of an infinite series of finite causes. A finite cause necessarily determines a limit, no matter how often repeated. A three-foot rule will determine just the limit of three feet every time it is laid down. It can never reach infinity. Consequently, to avoid the logical absurdity of an endless regressus without the possibility of any result, the human mind is compelled to recognize a first cause which, as such, is itself

Digitized by Google

uncaused. Thus the notion of an eternal first cause is a compulsion of the reason, carrying with it the notion of an infinite, and excluding the notion of a finite.

The notion of the first cause does not spring from the difficulty of conceiving either a limit or its opposite notion. It springs from the compulsion of the law of cause and effect—from the necessity of finding a beginning of causes; and as the beginning of causes must itself exist without a beginning, the notion of an eternal first cause is compulsory—a compulsion of the reason, and not the bastard product of the "difficulty of conceiving the opposite notion of an absolute finite." The mathematical doctrine of infinity, produced by an infinite reduplification of finites is only hypothetically true. If finites could be infinitely repeated, possibly infinity might be reached. But no number of repetitions of things finite, could ever make them anything but what they are—that is, things with an intrinsic limitation. Every repetition of a finite would still yield a finite in time as well as in space. As already suggested, a yardstick laid down ever so often would always develop the limitation of just three feet; and as just so much time would be occupied in laying it down, it defines a limit of time which would forever forbid the realization of infinity in time, not less than in space. The finite in time or space can never reach the infinite. Mr. Poe's ingenious argument proves a contradiction—finity and infinity as both the attributes of first cause—which is a fair match for the "identical nothing" which he so amusingly accepts as the outcome of his definition of first cause.

4. Then the next step preparatory to the introduction of the theory is taken—what he calls the "irrelativity" of the particle; or perhaps, more accurately, the opening of the theory with an account of the extraordinary character which is attached to it—which he terms its "irrelativity." The sole assumption which Mr. Poe asserts that he makes in the whole development of his discourse, is that the original production of matter was the creation by God—"by dint of his volition"—"out of himself or nihility." This primary creation "or first theory," was in the shape of an absolute unity in the strictest sense of the term. Matter appeared in its uttermost "simplicity." Language is used with the utmost care to express the notion of a single par-

Digitized by Google

ticle—an absolute unity—a particle at all points. His object is to explain the genesis of the universe, and develop the rationale of its fundamental laws—gravity and electricity. He begins with an effort to conceive "what matter must be when or if in its absolute extreme of simplicity." "Here," he goes on to say, "the reason flies at once to imparticularity—to a particle—to one particle—a particle of one kind—a particle, therefore, without form and void—of one character—a particle positively—a particle at all points—a particle absolutely unique, individual, undivided. and not indivisible only because he who created it by dint of his will, can by an infinitely less energetic exercise of the same will, as a matter of course, divide it." Eureka, p. 26. "Oneness, then, is all that I predicate of the originally created matter; but I propose to show that this oneness is a principle abundantly sufficient to account for the constitution, the existing phenomena, and the plainly inevitable annihilation of at least the material universe." pp. 26-27. This oneness of the particle is distinguished by the ascription to it of "absolute irrelativity." It is spoken of as "the emphatically irrelative one." The laborious description given above, as an absolute unit—the very expression of simplicity of constitution—the very perfection of a monad constituent, "indivisible" only because it had not escaped from the control of the infinite God. When this monad particle had been brought into being, it defined the universe in a concentrated form. But the constitution of the universe was to be effected by forcing this original unit particle into the abnormal plurality which actually appears. Then as the divine counsel passes on to its next process, the unity of the particle is broken up; and its constituent atoms—which are singular predicates of the strict simplicity of a monad constitution—are driven by irradiation to the utmost bounds of the mighty sphere marked out as the predestined limit of the universe. Two grand forces are ascribed to the particle—gravity and electricity—which are afterwards broadened into the more accurate and perfectly descriptive terms, attraction and repulsion. These forces, which are essential opposites, are in equilibrio in the particle at the time of its creation; but when the time comes, the fiat of the almighty opens a struggle between them—the one to accomplish the distribution of the atoms—the other to restore them to the

Digitized by Google

original unity of the primordial creation. This is done by the fiat of the Almighty, which relaxes the restraints of the attractive force and lets loose the repulsive energy to separate the particle into its constituent atoms, and drive them to the utmost limits of the appointed sphere. These atoms are determined into different sizes,, shapes, weights, and as the outward movement goes on, into unequal distances from each other. The power of the attractive energy, relatively weakened, or at least controlled by the divine will, still, however, exerts a powerful influence over the flying atoms; and the combined effect of the two forces sets up a rotary motion, which is greatly aided by the differences in the atoms themselves. This rotary action, increasing in its mighty movement, finally begins to throw off particular masses of the coalescent atoms, until the original nucleus of the formed worlds, expands into the glorious star which it was designed to establish. This revolution, set up by the contending powers of attraction and repulsion, or gravity and electricity, is allowed to work out its sublime result in the formation of the universe of stars; and then, when the time comes in the counsel of God, the outward movement is arrested, and the return to the original unity of the particle is begun and carried onward until the restoration is completed, preparatory to its final annihilation, and return into the Godhood itself. All this suggestion of the genesis of the universe is described by the genius of a great poet in terms striking in the extreme! Little justice can be done to it in a brief analysis; but the general theory propounded in Eureka can be seen in a mere outline.

5. A singular attribute is ascribed to the particle, in its preparation for its final uses, which is styled its "irrelativity." This "irrelativity" is made fundamental to the whole theory of the distinguished writer, for a reason which will appear when this extraordinary attribute is defined. In what sense is this "irrelativity" to be taken? The phrases which are connected with it are somewhat mixed. The particle is spoken of as "created." If created in the usual sense of the term, it is impossible to extinguish its relation to its creator; or denying a creator, it must be related to the force—whatever that may be—which produced it. If, in the primordial monad unity, atoms are supposed to reside—which seems to be contradictory—the

Digitized by Google

particle is also relative to its component parts; for the removal of any one or more of these atoms from the particle will necessarily establish a relation between these translated atoms and the particle itself.

The "irrelativity" is probably predicated on the fact that the particle is supposed to be the only being then in existence, or because it is a simple monad. In what sense can the particle be construed as the only being in existence? If created, its creator must exist. If produced, the force that produced it is distinguishable from it. But, perhaps, irrelativity is predicated on the fact which is asserted in the end—that the particle is a development of the deity, who is credited with its creation or production. Even on this supposition, the new garment in which the deity appears, is something different from his previous conditions; and if so, a relation is not extinguished. The development of deity cannot escape the imputation of the production of a new phenomenon; and the ascription of an absolute "irrelativity" is still faulty. A similar plea would make the entire visible universe "irrelative." The ascription of an atomic constitution to a monad of absolute simplicity also appears to be a contradiction. Irrelation appears to imply something absolutely out of relation to any other entity whatever. Mr. Poe pronounces it a far better postulate for the origin and development of the universe than any axiom or axiomatic truth, or than any inductive or deductive process of reasoning from those heavens which declare the glory of God. It would seem to be superfluous to discredit either the axiom or the methods of induction or deduction, since Mr. Poe has accredited at least all axioms which are the result of forgotten processes of those methods which have never disclosed themselves to human apprehension. It would seem that a better basis than this vague and discredited "irrelation" might be found in the intuitive law of cause and effect, which demands that the universe should show some cause of its existence, and not rest the solution on the bare fact which is supposed to underlie its "irrelativity" that it was a unit in itself, and the only thing in existence. Certainly this latter claim is doubtful at least, or rather not doubtfully false as long as a creator was at the back of it. The denial that anything was at the back of it, begins to reveal the urgency with which "irrela-

Digitized by Google

tivity" is asserted. It is also shrewdly suggested that Mr. Poe felt this difficulty in the explanation of the genesis of the particle, by the elaborate pains which he takes to make it appear that irrelativity revealed "a beginning"—an "absolute beginning"—a "beginning that had nothing behind it or before it"—a beginning in fact—"a beginning and nothing different from a beginning"—in short, a beginning that was what it was—"a true beginning." This laborious effort is designed to show that the particle had no beginning except what it found in itself.

That which has nothing behind it or before it, is, of course, an original or "first thing." In other words, we have here that "first thing" mentioned in the "general proposition" with which Mr. Poe sets out in the beginning of Eureka, and states with such oracular profundity: "In the original unity of the first thing lies the secondary cause of all things, with the germ of their inevitable annihilation." That is to say, "the irrelativity" on which such emphasis is laid is simply the assertion of a thing which is asserted to exist without a cause. It is not merely the equivalent, but very nearly an identity with Hume's "Singular Effect," by which he means an effect without a cause. It is intended to pave the way for the Pantheistic conclusion; and it is fundamental for that purpose. But even on that supposition, the law of cause and effect cannot be balked, for the visible material particle is due to the evolution of a deity affirmed to be spiritual; and the evolution into matter is the effect of a cause found in the deity. The intense exertion to make out the origin of the particle to be an "absolute beginning," without any cause—with nothing behind it or before it, is an effort to establish an absurdity. It could only come from a verbal delusion. To define a beginning in the agonistic terms, which the acute writer employs, is to define an "absolute beginning" which is absurd—an intrinsic absurdity. The law of cause and effect is imperious. That which begins must have a cause of its beginning. Nothing which exists absolutely can have a beginning. God is the only absolute and uncaused being. He has no beginning, and is therefore eternal; and as such, must be the beginning of all that exists. Whatever begins must have something before or behind it. The postulate "an absolute beginning," or its equivalent, "a beginning from eternity," is

Digitized by Google

absurd and contradictory. The assumption of a created, or developed, or produced particle—with nothing behind it or before it—nothing behind it in power or before it in time—is an assumption which will not support the daring and presumptuous structure built upon it, just because it has no standing of its own. There is no necessary connection between Mr. Poe's theory of matter and its distribution and return to unity on the one hand; and his theory of the "irrelativity" of the material particle and "an absolute beginning" on the other. The theory of the distribution and return of the atoms is very beautiful; and it is within the range of possibility that it may be true. But there is no reason why it might not be true of a particle with a cause behind it, as of a particle without one. The theory of "irrelativity" is false and absurd. The first theory has God behind it, and may possibly describe his method of creation. The second theory postulates a beginning which has nothing behind it or before it—which cannot possibly be true.

6. It will be recalled that Mr. Poe's definition of matter is that matter is attraction and repulsion, gravity and electricity. Atoms are also recognized and affirmed. Gravity or attraction is commonly construed as holding the atoms together, and thus creating certain qualities of matter, such as weight and impenetrability. But if matter is wholly composed of attraction and repulsion, what function is discharged by the atoms? Does gravity compose the atoms themselves; or is the atom a separate entity on which gravity has no functional action? If it is a separate and independent entity, in the structure of which gravity has no concern, and over which it has no jurisdiction except to attract and repel them, is it not more accurate and scientific to postulate attraction and repulsion—gravity and electricity as qualities of matter, than to construe them as matter itself? It would certainly be more rational to construe them as qualities of matter, because a function would then be found for the atom, which is excluded by making attraction and repulsion the whole of matter. The old definition of matter so far as an impenetrable mystery is capable of definition, regarded attraction and repulsion as variable qualities of matter, and the attributes of a substance or substratum of qualities. Moreover, Mr. Poe predicates attraction as the force called gravity, and repulsion as

Digitized by Google

electricity. But it is an accepted scientific fact that electricity exerts an attractive, as well as a repulsive force, according as it is positive or negative. Does not this fact intimate that the fundamental definition of gravity and electricity is not properly discriminated, and as such is faulty? Is not the definition of matter by Mr. Poe really an assumption? If so, it looks as if the grand conclusion of a Pantheistic constitution of the universe based upon this definition of matter—exceptionable on more than one account—was also discredited. We are instructed by Eureka that when the reaction, produced by gravity—in order to the return of the atoms to the unity of the particle—is completed by the reconstruction of the one original sphere, that, then, attraction and repulsion cease—that matter ceases—that its reason of being ceasing, matter itself comes to an end—and that all becomes spirit—all becomes God. But if attraction and repulsion are not all of matter—if they are merely attributes of a substratum, the final consolidation must include the substratum; attraction and repulsion do not cease; they merely become latent; matter remains matter; and the basis of the transformation into deity is abolished.

(To be continued.)

Digitized by Google

THE HISTORY OF THE PRESBYTERIANS; A SKETCH.

By Prof. Thomas Cary Johnson, D. D.

Not a few persons think of the term "Presbyterians" as a sectarian, or denominational appellative, of certain modern Christian sects. A glossary of ecclesiastical terms, in wide circulation, describes Presbyterians as "the followers of Calvin, Beza and other Reformers; so-called in England in the seventeenth century." This description at once informs and misinforms. It is a fact that the *struggle* between certain advocates of representative church government, on the one side, and, of prelatical church government, on the other side, during the latter part of the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth century, was the occasion on which Christians of a given type were first habitually called Presbyterians. It is a fact, also that the bodies of Christians to whom the term was thus applied in Scotland and England, stood to John Calvin in intimate relations. But it is no less a fact that these British seventeenth century admirers of Calvin regarded him not as the originator but the restorer of Presbyterianism; it is no less a fact that the form of Christianity, generally called Presbyterianism only as late as the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries, had existed and prevailed in the Christian Church a millennium and a half before Calvin had produced his immortal institutes, or attempted to apply not only the truth of God, but the power of God, to the lives of his people in the corrupt town of Geneva; it is no less a fact that Christ and the College of the Apostles, when giving to the Church its Christian form, gave it the Presbyterian form. Nay; somewhat more may be asserted: Some of the essential features of Presbyterianism had come down, more or less distinctly evolved, too, through God's chosen people, from the time of Ezra, and some of them from the time ofMoses and beyond. Students of at least relative competence have asserted, that "During the whole tract of time embraced in the history of the Mosaic economy, we have

Digitized by Google

complete evidence that the ecclesiastical government, as well as the civil, was conducted, under God, the Supreme Ruler, by boards of elders, acting as authorized representatives of the people;" that to this mode of government "every city and every synagogue was accustomed;" that "the representative system was universally in use;" and, further, "that as each particular synagogue was governed by a bench of elders, of which the bishop or 'angel of the church' was the presiding officer; so, also, as the whole Jewish body was one—one Catholic church—there were always appeals admitted, in cases of incorrectness of judgment, to the 'Great Synagogue' at Jerusalem, where an opportunity was given for redressing what was done amiss;" and that "a system, which bound the whole community together as one visible professing body, was uniformly in operation." Certainly it may be safely asserted that Presbyterianism was essentially involved in Old Testament religion.

The subject before us—the historical development of Presbyterians—is no modern phenomenon. Names are frequently much younger than the objects to which they are applied. There were Christians, years before the disciples at Antioch were so-called. There were Trinitarians long before the term Trinitarian had been coined. There were Erastians in church government thousands of years before the term Erastian was applied to those who held that Church and State should be united and the State dominant over the Church, particularly in all matters of government and discipline. All must admit that Presbyterians are older than their name. Even those who would have John Calvin to have originated Presbyterians, must remember that they were not generally so-called in his day. If men will face the facts, they must admit more—that Presbypterians had figured in the world long centuries back of the time when they were first so-called.

Were we to attempt a complete sketch of Presbyterians, we would have to begin not only far back of the latter half of the sixteenth century, far back of Calvin's age; we would have to take account of Presbyterianism not only as the oldest phase of Christianity, and as the Catholic, or general, phase of Christianity in the Apostolic age; a complete sketch of Presbyterians would necessarily include some account of certain features of

Digitized by Google

the Mosaic economy, and would deal in pregnant outline with the religion of the synagogue.

Our limits as to space make it necessary that we should not, on this occasion, attempt to deal with Presbyterians since their origin, but, at the most, with Presbyterians since the time of Christ. Accordingly, we shall proceed to sketch our subject under the following heads:

I. Presbyterians in the Apostolic Age.

II. Presbyterians between the End of the Apostolic Age and the Epoch of the Reformation.

III. Presbyterians in John Calvin's Day and since.

I. *Presbyterians in the Apostolic Age.*—From the literature of the Apostolic age, we can learn nothing of any other form of Christianity as favored by an inspired apostle. We see Christ and his apostles teaching Presbyterian doctrine, exercising Presbyterian government, conducting Presbyterian worship, and exhibiting the Presbyterian type of life. It is, of course, not held that the apostles presented creed books, such as modern churches have elaborated, in a scientific and systematic way. It is not meant that the *Church,* as it left the hands of the apostles, *set forth,* with the fulness and exactitude of technical definition to which the Westminster Assembly attained, that essential view of Christianity which we have in our Westminster Standards. But it is held that the living form of Christianity in the apostolic age was genuinely Presbyterian; it is held that the early Church, while not setting forth scientifically the Presbyterian doctrine, polity, worship, etc., yet did set it forth in the living form in which Christianity stands recorded in the New Testament. Intelligent Christians, generally, hold that the Christians of the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic age were Trinitarians; and were believers in the true Deity, true humanity and single personality of the Lord Jesus Christ; while, yet, it is notorious that the Church only reached the technical and scientific ability to state the doctrines of the Trinity and Christology after centuries of struggle. Now, as the Apostolic Church was Trinitarian, so was it also, we hold, Presbyterian; it held the view of doctrine called Presbyterian, exercised the Presbyterian order of worship, and the Presbyterian form of government, and maintained the Presbyterian ideal of life.

Digitized by Google

If the Apostolic Church was Trinitarian, and if it believed Christ to be the Godman, one person in two distinct natures, one human and the other divine; it no less certainly took the view that *by nature man is not subject to the law of God, and as carnal, cannot be;* that *every son of Adam, save one, is a sinner by nature, perferring his own ends to God's glory, and his own impulses to God's law as a rule of his life—set in his way of sinning; that he cannot help himself, because he will not help himself; that, hence, if he is to be saved it must be gratuitously and by the mediation of One who is both man and God—man that he may stand in man's stead and bear the penalty due to man as a sinner; and God that his expiation may satisfy the Divine justice, which is inexorable in its demands for righteousness. It took the view that out of his infinite grace, God determined that he would save from this mass of perdition "a great multitude that no man can number;" that he sent forth his Son to be the propitiation for their sin—to be their prophet, priest and king; that he predestinated them to be transformed into the image of his Son; and that whom he did predestinate to this image, them he also effectually called; and that whom he called, them he also justified, counted righteous, and whom he justified, them he also sanctified, and whom he sanctified, them he also glorified.* Yes; according to the New Testament, and the Old, for that matter, salvation is all of God. We do not find the name of total depravity, unconditional election, particular redemption, efficacious grace, and perseverance of the saints, the emphasis of which, some have thought to be a distinctive mark of the Presbyterian form of the Christian doctrine; but we do find the doctrines, held in a most practical and living way. While magnifying the sovereignty of God, the Apostolic Church was careful to inculcate man's own responsibility. Not to particularize further, it received and adopted the Scriptures as being a revelation of the mind and will of God as given by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, touching his glorious plan of saving helplessly lost men. That the Apostolic Church held these doctrines, including "total depravity," and "election of grace," we feel not the less assured, when we recall, that when, in the Reformation epoch, God sent down his Spirit, the mighty men upon whom he came, and who, in consequence of his coming upon them,

Digitized by Google

became the leaders of the Reform Movement, maintained them as the doctrines of Divine revelation. Martin Luther, Peter Martyr, Bullinger, Bugenhagen, Patrick Hamilton, George Wishart, Archbishop Cranmer, Bishops Ridley, Latimer and Hooper, Archbishop Grindal, John Knox, *et id omne genus,* thought they saw these doctrines set forth in Apostolic literature. Yes; the makers of all the great early Protestant Confessions—Lutheran and Anglican, as well as Reformed—save the Formula of Concord only, however, differing on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper and correlated topics, agreed as to the great body of doctrines maintained by Presbyterians, including those so-called hard doctrines, for which the latter have been so maligned.

Back of the Reformation, Wycliffe, Hus, and many noble sons of God, took the same view. Nay, more; Augustine, the Prince of the Patristic fathers, a man singularly honored in profession by the Roman Catholic Church, which puts him into her little class of *"Doctores Ecclesiae,"* while she quietly but pertinaciously repudiates his teaching,—Augustine held the lamp aloft by which the Reformers read so well these truths in the Sacred Scripture.

Sound Presbyterians of to-day stand in a great and noble company when they maintain that the Apostolic Church held the doctrines known since the seventeenth century as the doctrines of the Presbyterians.

If the Apostolic Church was Presbyterian in doctrine, it was no less Presbyterian in its form of government. The Apostolic Church exercised the republican type of government, both in its local organizations and in the Church as a whole. Go into an Apostolic church, as into the little Church of Philippi, or into one of the little churches of Crete, or into the larger Church of Ephesus, you will find the power of government in the hands of officers, who have been chosen by the suffrages of the Christian people of their respective congregations, and who are called, now bishops, and now presbyters; you will observe only this one order of ruling officers. There are, indeed, in this one order of rulers, two classes, one of which is devoted to the functions of ruling and teaching; and the other, to the function of ruling alone. But, as rulers, they are all officially equal. You cannot be mistaken in judging that the presbyters and bishops are

Digitized by Google

identical. You find the officers of the Church of Ephesus, for example, designated as presbyters in Acts xx. 17, called bishops in Acts xx. 28; you read Peter's exhortation to presbyters to tend the flock of God, and "to fulfill the *office of bishops* with disinterested devotion and without "lording it over God's heritage." You note many other proofs of the identity of presbyters and bishops. The proof is so manifest that not only modern Presbyterians, but a multitude of scholarly men throughout the ages have seen it, and taught it, ascribing the distinction between the bishop and the presbyter to usage, and denying it to be of inspired institution. Thus the great Augustine writes to his contemporary, Jerome, who was a presbyter: "I entreat you to correct me faithfully when you see I need it; for, although, according to the names of honor, which the usage of the Church has come *now* to have, the office of bishop is greater than that of presbyter, nevertheless, in many respects Augustine is inferior to Jerome." (Epistolo lxxxii., ad Heironymum, p. 35.) Jerome, who also is placed by the Roman Catholic Church in the very small class of *Doctores Ecclesiae,* and than whom no man in the first fourteen centuries after the Apostolic age was fitter to speak on the subject, observes in his commentary on Titus: "Before that, by the prompting of the devil, there were parties in religion, and it was said among the people, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, the churches were governed by the common council of the presbyters. But *after that each one began to reckon those whom he baptized as belonging to himself* and not to Christ, it was *decreed throughout the whole world* that one elected from the presbyters should be set over the rest, that he should have the care of the whole church that the *seeds of schism* might be destroyed. Should any one think that the identification of bishop and presbyter, the one being a name of age and the other of office, is not a doctrine of Scripture, but our own opinion, let him refer to the words of the apostle saying to the Philippians: 'Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ to all the saints in Christ Jesus, which are at Philippi, *with the bishops and deacons,* Grace to you and peace,' and so forth. Philippi is one city of Macedonia, and truly in one city there cannot be as is thought, more than one bishop; but because at that time they called the same parties bishops and presbyters, therefore he speaks of bishops as of presbyters." And Jerome

Digitized by Google

continues his argument for the identity of these officers, expounding Acts xx. 17, 28; Heb. xiii. 17; 1 Pet. v. 1, 2, in a most praiseworthy fashion. He then concludes: "We may thus show that anciently bishops and presbyters were the same; but *by degrees, that the plants of Dissension might be rooted up,* all care was transferred to one. As therefore, the presbyters know that, in accordance with *the custom of the church,* they are subject to him who has been *set over them, so the bishops* should know that they are greater than the presbyters rather by *custom* than by the truth of an arrangement of the Lord." (For the translation see Killen; Ancient Church pp. 524-527.) In another passage (*Epist. ad Evangelum*) Jerome informs us that this elevation of one to be bishop took place after the end of the Apostolic age. According to Dr. Philip Schaff, even Pope Urban II. (A. D. 1091) says that the primitive Church knew only two orders—the deaconate and the presbyter-ate. The original identity of presbyters and bishops is not only insisted on by Presbyterians, Lutherans and Congregationalists, but freely conceded also by Episcopal commentators, as Whitby, Bloomfield, Conybeare and Howson, Alford, Ellicot, Lightfoot, Stanley and other." Lightfoot teaches us that the officers called presbyters in the Jewish Christian Churches were called bishops in the Gentile Christian Churches. He says that it is clear that "at the close of the Apostolic age, the lower orders of the threefold ministry were firmly and widely established;" but that "the traces of the third and highest order, the Episcopate properly so-called, are few and indistinct." He takes the view that the Episcopate was developed from the Presbytrate. He would see in James of Jerusalem a sort of "bishop properly so-called." His great honesty compells him to say, however, that "though specially prominent, James appears in the Acts as a member of the body of presbyters—that "he was, in fact, head or president of the college." He holds that, on the other hand, the Gentile churches of the Apostolic age present no distinct traces of a similar development toward the "Episcopate properly so-called." (Epistles of St. Paul: Philippians, pp. 184, ff.)

The ruling officers, which Jewish Christians commonly called elders, and Gentile Christians commonly called bishops, being a plurality in every local church, little or big, had, in order to govern with decency and order, to organize under a moderator,

Digitized by Google

deliberate over proposed ecclesiastical action, have a motion made, take a vote, and thus, by the majority vote, fix upon the course of action. It was not only necessary in order to decency and order, that the presbyters should rule jointly; they were naturally led to ruling in this way by the examples of the benches of the elders in the Jewish synagogues scattered throughout the Graeco-Roman world. In looking on the Presbytery ordaining Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 14) you would not have been able to differentiate it from one of our sessions, perhaps. The body of presbyters constituted an organized bench, or parliament, or court, and as such did their work. Not only do you see this sort of rule in the local churches; go to Jerusalem about 50 A. D., and step into the Jerusalem Council, called to determine as to certain matters exciting greatly the Christians at Antioch about that time. These matters are recognized as of interest to the whole church. Two different local churches, and how many more we cannot say, got their commissioners together in this council to deliberate and determine. This is only one of many indications that the local Apostolic Churches regarded themselves as organic parts of a great whole, inclusive of all the churches. The organization of this Jerusalem Assembly is very much that of Presbyterian ecclesiastical courts superior to the session. It is a court of rulers, called apostles and elders, but with the apostles acting in the court just as elders themselves.

But, if the Apostolic Church was Presbyterian in faith, and in polity, it is no less Presbyterian in life. You can see that they give place in thought and action to the notion and requirement of duty. You hear them saying to their earthly rulers: "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." These Christians that teach you, in one breath, that the earthly "powers that be are ordained of God," teach also that God is the *great sovereign,* and that little earthly potentates must not expect their obedience, in case they command anything contrary to the injunctions of the Lord God Almighty.

Much more you may see of the life of the Apostolic Church, making it clear that you have found, current in the Apostolic age, ideals that the noblest Presbyterians of later ages would have embraced as their very own. If Paul's doctrinal teaching in the eighth and ninth chapters of Romans is Presbyterian doc-

Digitized by Google

trine, no less surely does he set forth in a Presbyterian fashion, appealing at once to the noblest appetencies of regenerate human nature, our obligation to Christian service, in the twelfth chapter of the same epistle: "I beseech you, therefore, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God which is your reasonable service; and be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind that ye may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God." The stern condemnation of evil and the contempt for follies, the having one's conversation in things above and not in things on the earth, are other features one must note, and remark their counterparts in the noblest Presbyterian character of modern times. In a word, you may note the dignifying and glorifying of individual manhood and womanhood, the transformation of home into an earthly heaven, the progressive ennoblement of the whole Christian society into Christliness.

The worship of the Apostolic Church—transformed synagogue worship, was so evidently like the simpler Presbyterian, Puritan types of worship of modern times, that we may properly waive its illustrations.

This early Presbyterianism was mightily missionary. The greatest Presbyterian in the Apostolic Church was the greatest missionary of the ages, doing a vast amount of work strategically, thoroughly and effectively. He went at the work from a sense of duty, inspired by Christ's command, was kept at it by that and Christ's constraining love; carried with him in the work a sense of the unity of the whole Church and of her part in his work; reported from time to time to his mother presbytery; and carried to the superior court, questions of general interest which arose in connection with the progress of his cause. The Church at large not only responded to Paul in Presbyterian fashion; but according to the measure of its opportunities, so propagated the truth that it grew by leaps and bounds under the good hand of God.

Presbyterianism was a form of Apostolical Christianity. It was the prevailing form of it. We have found no other form of it in that age. Presbyterians had not been so-called. They had been known simply as Christians. Under the circumstances, that was the best name for them.

II. *The Presbyterians between the End of the Apostolic Age*

Digitized by Google

and the Epoch of the Reformation.—With the close of the Apostolic age, Christians began, on the one hand, a slow, painful and faltering advance toward the scientific grasp and technical and systematic statement of Scripture teaching; and on the other hand, began the appropriation of and building into their beliefs, and applying in their practices, elements foreign to and at war with Christianity as divinely established in the Apostolic age. As illustrative of their progress into the scientific grasp of the truth, may be instanced their statement of the doctrine of the Trinity in the Councils of Nicea (A. D., 325), and Constantinople, A. D., 381; their statement of the doctrine concerning Christ's person and natures, in the Council of Chalcedon, 451; their exposition of the doctrines of sin and grace through Augustine in the closing years of the fourth century and the opening years of the fifth century (though here a large part of the Church revolted from Augustine's teaching); and in the exposition of the true doctrine of the atonement by the saintly Anselm and Thomas Aquinas in the Middle Ages, (though here, again, the truth brought out was rejected save by a party). So far as the Church accepted these teachings, it continued to be, in doctrine, like the primitive Presbyterian Church of the Apostolic age, save that it was acquiring a more scientific grasp of those original teachings. Over against these instances of progress into the truth, doctrinal change for the worse also proceeded; slowly at first, but more rapidly as the centuries passed. In the second and third centuries, work-righteousness began to creep in; and the sacramental symbols came to be regarded as having spiritual graces tied to them by indissoluble bonds. In the sixth century, the Bible doctrine of sin, the doctrine of man's moral helplessness, together with his responsibility, the doctrine of the Divine Sovereignty, the doctrine of salvation by faith, and their correlates were forgotten for the most part—buried—to be resurrected only by the Reformers.

When the doctrines of man's moral inability for the good, and election of grace, and their correlates, were taken away, Christianity had lost most important features. It was no longer in its primitive, Presbyterian phase. It was moving with an ever-growing turgidness toward the teachings of the Council of Trent and the Vatican.

In the sphere of government, a more thorough going and

Digitized by Google

vicious change rapidly proceeded. As there is no reasonable ground for doubting that the Apostolic Church was what, in modern parlance would be described as Presbyterian in government, so there is just as little ground for doubting that in certain quarters, as early as A. D. 250, full-fledged old Catholic Episcopacy was coming into its place; just as little ground to doubt that Episcopacy took practically the whole Church, in the course of the next three or four centuries; just as little ground to doubt, that, meanwhile, Episcopacy was developing through the Metropolitan and patriarchal stages; that, in the West it passed, after the close of the sixth century, into the Papal system of the Mediaeval Church; and that pure Presbyterianism was no more seen until the epoch of the Reformation.

As early as the middle of the second century, the presbyters of certain churches had begun to give up their prerogative of the joint government of their churches, permitting their presiding officer, who had been chosen for his abilities, singly to wield the ecclesiastical power. These presbyters probably had felt that they were doing a very amiable thing in stripping themselves of power and concentrating it into the hands of their strong brother. For, under the influence of current civil ideals in the Roman Empire, they believed that monarchical government was more effective than representative; that a Cincinnatian dictator would serve better than a senate. Hence, they turned their president of the session into a monarch of the congregation.

Through the close connection between any old first Church and its colonies, or daughter churches, the bishop of the mother church easily extended his monarchical rule by degrees over the colonies. Thus was the diocesan bishops, in the course of time, evolved. After a time, the more favored diocesans grew into metropolitans, exercising ecclesiastical lordship over a number of diocesans. Similarly, the more favored metrouolitans grew into patriarchs; and, ater a time, one of this small body of oligarchs grew into the Pope of Rome. The presbyters of the sub-Apostolic age, in conferring their own God-given prerogatives on one of their number, were consulting expediency, walking in the light o their own eyes, leaning unto their own understanding, instead of taking heed unto their way according to God's word. They had forgotten, too, the importance of the maxim: *Obsta principiis.* They were planting the seed in which

Digitized by Google

were wrapped up all the usurpations, exactions, extortions, abuses and nastiness of papacy and prelacy, as well as overthrowing the God-given form of church government.

The Presbyterian type of life passed away on the heels of the changes in doctrine and government. By the middle of the third century the ideal of a Godly life was becoming misshapen, owing to the growing presence of asceticism. The notion was coming in that, in order to live the holiest life, there must be no marriage, there must be no individual ownership of property; and the body must be depressed by fasts, vigils, flagellations, squalor or filth, etc. Along with this ideal as to what was necessary to the highest holiness, came a lowered demand for a strenuous moral endeavor, on the part of the whole mass of believers, to live in accord with the demands of God's law. And, in the centuries included in the great era usually described by historians as Mediaeval (590-1517) there came about, owing to various causes, a wide divorce between morals and religion; so that the most religious after a sort might be grossly immoral. Gross immorality abounded; and, amongst even the choicer spirits, there prevailed widely an indifference to the obligation to be straightforward in behavior and true in speech. Many of the noblest Christian teachers justified indirection and deceit when employed as a means for the glorification of the Church. Augustine is the one man in his century, known to us, who plead that one must in writing, or speaking, for God's cause, write or speak always in accord with truth; the one man to maintain that one must never for any supposedly good end, write or speak that which he does not hold to be the truth. His century, be it remembered, was adorned, too, by Jerome and Chrysostom. They justified *ruses*. We are not sorry to recall, in this connection, that Augustine, who was morally too big to justify them, *was*, in much of his theology, particularly on the doctrines of sin, salvation by grace, election of grace, predestination, *what*, in common speech, would be called Presbyterian. The legitimate fruit of those doctrines, sorely abused though they have been, is high moral manhood. The practical recognition of God's sovereignty and man's responsibility should lift every teacher and every Christian above the commendation of a lie.

It is not meant, of course, that there were no noble Christian souls in these long centuries. The contrary is true. These were

Digitized by Google

the centuries within which lived Anselm, and Bernard of Clairvoux and Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura. John Calvin or John Knox would have exulted in the privilege of communion with the author of the *Cur Deus Homo,* of conferring about that infinite justice which inexorably demanded that sin should be punished according to all its infinite heinousness; or in the privilege of communion with Thomas Aquinas about the substitutionary nature of Christ's sacrifice. There were Christians who, on one side or other, had come into a nobility of character truly admirable; yet it is clear, even to a casual observer, that their ideal of life is, in important respects, not that of the New Testament Church. Signs, indeed, of the resurrection of this type of life there are, as in the Waldenses, in Wycliffe and his followers, in John Hus, and Jerome of Prague and their Bohemian followers, but speaking broadly, the Presbyterian ideal of life found few to strive for its realization during all the days between the epoch of Constantine the Great and the Reformation.

In the department of worship, a similar change went on. The simple New Testament type of worship gave way to one that the Church deemed better. Even in the sub-Apostolic age this change began. The whole witness-bearing, teaching aspect of worship, was allowed to sink largely into disuse and oblivion; and the Church came to be looked upon as invested with power, through her sacraments, and the priesthood, to lift men into light, life and glory. The ministers of worship were slowly transformed into special priests, the universal spiritual priesthood retreated. The business of the priest was chiefly to offer sacrifices and administer sacraments in a way supposed to be valid. Meanwhile the services became, by degrees, highly liturgical and ritualistic, appealing to the senses, imagination and superstition, whereas, in the New Testament, they appealed to the moral and spiritual affections. Sacraments were added to those enjoined in the Word of God, and these latter were doctored into shapes and significances unknown to New Testament times. The rite of baptism was perverted in matter and form, in power and significance, by the conjunction therewith of a number of man-devised additions, and by the efforts to connect in a physical way, spiritual grace with material emblems. The rite of the Lord's Supper was gradually and surely changed through the slow course of ten centuries and more, till it bore

Digitized by Google

the aspect given it in the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation and the mass—an unbloody repetition of Christ's sacrifice on the cross.

There was, with the early movements of the great Reformation in the first quarter of the sixteenth century, a return toward the Presbyterian type of Christianity. The two great fundamental principles of the Lutheran Reformation, viz.: Justification by faith, and the Bible the one source of authority in religion, so far as they were adopted, brought Christianity back toward the primitive form. But the proximate restoration of that form was to be more completely wrought out by one who outranked Luther in point of intellect, acquaintanceship with the Bible, power of systematic concatenation and representation of the truth, humble reverence for God's plan as revealed in his word, and the consistent and fearless effort to give the plan, in proximate entirety, practical application. The restorer of Presbyterianism, under the good hand of God, was John Calvin.

(*To be continued.*)

Digitized by Google

THE MODEL PREACHER.

By Rev. Warren H. Stuart, Fishersville, Va.

"And daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ."—Acts v. 42.

The Book of Acts is one of the most helpful books in the whole Bible for the individual Christian, and especially for the Christian worker; for it is not only devotional and uplifting, but intensely practical as well. It is calculated to help each one of us in our Christian life; but also, and especially, does it teach us to help others in their Christian life. The other books of the New Testament may be used for self-culture; this book is to be used as a manual in Christian work.

For such a purpose, this book has a peculiar fitness, in that it teaches by example, not precept. Here is theory translated into action. The very name shows that. Here are acts performed to build up and extend Christ's kingdom, and recorded for our imitation. For, it will be admitted, the Book of Acts contains complete standards of Christian activity. What is recorded there with approval, is the model approved by the Holy Spirit for all future ages of the Church. There is, indeed, an advance over what existed during the earthly life of Jesus. Such was to be expected. The new dispensation did not fully begin until Christ had ascended into the heavens. But what is here developed is in full accord with the teaching of the Master. The Apostles acted and spoke under inspiration of his spirit, and Luke was inspired in making his record. Here, then, is an inspired pattern of the Church and its work for all the future. It is a fragmentary book. Much is omitted that we would be interested in, such as the early life of Paul and the later labors of Peter and John. Whole blocks of the history are omitted, or condensed within the limits of a single verse.

The text of the present discourse is just such a summary, giving in a few short words *the substance and the form* of apostolic preaching. "And daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ." It will be our

Digitized by Google

purpose to unfold this brief but pregnant verse, and to learn from it some of the scriptural marks of the model preacher. In so doing, we shall consider (1) the manner, (2) the place, (3) the method, and (4) the subject-matter, of the apostles' preaching.

1. The *manner*. This is indicated by the words "daily," and "ceased not," or by a closer translation, "during every day they would not cease." The quality is that of persevering devotion. It is what men are devoted to that they concern themselves with day after day. These apostles "ceased not;" they persevered in the one thing to which they had devoted their lives. Discouragements, doubtless, arose; many of their labors seemed to be fruitless; indifference, opposition and persecution met them on every side, yet with all this, "they ceased not to teach and to preach Jesus Christ." Perseverance was the first great mark of the apostles' preaching. Herein lies a message for the ministry of to-day. Perseverance—not the mere continuous performance of routine duties, but the ever-ready, spontaneous, irrepressible voicing of the living Christ unto men. The apostles were so full of their message that they could not stop; it welled forth from them as water from a perennial spring. What our ministry needs to-day is to be so re-filled with a living message that daily, under all circumstances, in season and out of season, by voice and manner and bearing, we shall proclaim Christ. We are too apt to wait for Sunday to deliver a carefully-prepared sermon to God's congregated people; forgetting that, meanwhile there is every day an opportunity and a duty of preaching Christ; and if the opportunity does not come to us, it is our place to seek the opportunity. It is said of the late Mr. D. L. Moody that he made it the rule of his life never to let a day go by without speaking to some unsaved soul. Once a whole day passed, and 10 o'clock at night came, and he had spoken to no one yet. It was raining, and his wife protested; but Mr. Moody felt he must go out to find some one to reach for Christ. Soon he met a mechanic hurrying home from work. Mr. Moody joined him, fell into conversation with him about his soul, with the result that the man became a Christian and a valued worker in the Sunday-school. Mr. Moody, it seems to me, exemplifies the apostolic perseverance

Digitized by Google

in preaching. A heart so full could not rest until it had uttered its message. Would that we all had the same infilling!

2. We consider next the *place* of the apostles' preaching. According to the text, it was in the temple and in every house. Now, provided the outward surroundings are favorable, the place itself is a matter of small importance, save as it determines the character of the auditors. The apostles chose just such places to preach as ensured for them the best-disposed and best-prepared audiences—sought the most suitable soil for the implanting of their message. Their main preaching-places were the temple at Jerusalem, and in other places, the synagogues, where the more devout were to be found. Our Lord and his disciples, and the great apostle of the Gentiles, preached primarily among religious-minded people. There was more hope for fruit among them.

I remember as a boy going out with my father to sell Christian books among the heathen. We addressed ourselves almost entirely to a large crowd of pilgrims, who had come to the temple for worship. A question came into my mind and I said: "Father, why do we go after these pilgrims, who are already so set in their ways? Wouldn't it be better to try to reach the people in the city, who have almost no religion at all?" "No, my son," he replied, "I think not. Suppose there is a fork in the road here, and I am trying to get the people to take the right direction to a certain place; do you think I will have more chance of reaching those who are blundering down the wrong road, but going somewhere, or the man who sits down here idly on a stone, not caring to go anywhere?" The lesson is obvious. It may be added that recent reports from that same mission-field indicate the comparative barrenness of street-chapel preaching.

While street-preaching has its uses, and I would not disparage in the least the good thus accomplished, the place for reaching men with religion is the house of God. Men do not come to such a place without at least some interest in religion. The very fact that the building is one devoted to divine service imparts reverence and a readiness to receive divine truth. God himself, at least, seems to be more really present here than anywhere else. Every advantage favors the preacher. He has men in his own territory, attentive, reverent, interested. The wise farmer sows

Digitized by Google

his seed in soil that is prepared; and, humanly speaking, the place to preach so as to win men to Jesus Christ is in the church. But not alone in the church. Public proclaiming of the message ought to be followed up by talking with smaller groups and single persons, so as to meet individual needs. For this work the apostles chose that next great stronghold of religion, the home. They preached in every house, or as the Revised Version puts it, "at home." Next to the assembly for worship, the best soil to implant divine truth is to be found in the home. The sacredness of home softens the heart and commands respect for the message. The solidity of home-ties makes the impressions there received among the most lasting. The impressible minds of children are to be found in the home. Experience shows that cottage prayer-meetings and family worship have resulted in a great deal of good. Let us, as preachers, never forget the helpful audience of the home.

3. In the third place, the *method* of the apostles was to teach and to preach. Teaching is expounding a body of truths in their true relations one to another. It concerns itself chiefly with the intellect, and is pre-requisite to making any permanent impression. Men are sanctified through the truth, that is, an intelligent apprehension of the facts and their relations. The preacher should never neglect this—to secure in his hearers a clear, adequate grasp of the truth. But that is not enough. They ceased not to teach *and to preach.* The word here used in the original for "preach" is not the ordinary word, which means to "herald," but one meaning to evangelize, literally to give the glad tidings. Preaching is addressed to the feelings and the will. It is intended to comfort, strengthen, attract men. Expounding is objective, setting forth Christ and Him crucified; evangelizing is intensely personal, bringing the glad tidings home to every single hearer. We might teach Christ all day, and leave the sinner unconcerned; we cannot preach Christ without relating him very vitally to the sinner's need. By the one, men believe a truth; by the other, men trust a person. Not that the two can exist apart; but one is often emphasized at the expense of the other. Some preachers address themselves too exclusively to the intellect, and are thereby cold and unmoving; others too exclusively to the feelings and the will, giving not enough truth

Digitized by Google

to feed upon. In the model preacher, teaching and preaching will go hand in hand, each helping on the other. In religion, as well as in literature, men need both sweetness and light.

4. But all these details of manner, place and method, fade away into nothing beside the great subject-matter of the apostles' preaching. They preached Jesus Christ. Making due allowance for other helps, *here* is the secret of their success. Their theme was not an institution, a philosophy, an ethical system, though all these were involved; the core of their preaching, their central message, was the piercing, moving, personal gospel of Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God and Saviour of the world. How often in the Acts, as Bernard has pointed out in his *Progress of Doctrine,* do we find such expressions as these: "he preached Christ unto them;" "he preached unto him Jesus;" "he preached Christ in the synagogues," &c. No such announcements are found in the gospels. The preaching spoken of there is not of a person, but of a kingdom. Jesus comes preaching the kingdom of heaven, and his disciples are sent out to preach the kingdom of God. They are charged to tell no man that he was the Christ. Even after the resurrection the disciples ask when he will restore the kingdom to Israel? Such was the partial conception in their minds before the ascension; but after that, when the manifestation of Christ was complete, when he had said, "ye shall be witnesses unto me," when the Spirit had come and shown them the things concerning Jesus, then the keynote of their thought and of their preaching was changed. Before it was the kingdom, a new social fabric; now it was a new salvation, hope, life centering in a Person. And herein lies, I am convinced, the surprising difference in the effect of the preaching as seen in the gospels and in the Acts. For three years in the temple, in synagogues, in homes, and by the wayside, Jesus had been preaching with incomparable beauty and power; yet he left only a scanty band of followers, and them trembling and uncertain. But a few days later Peter lifts up his voice, and the same day there are added unto them about 3,000 souls. The word grows and multiplies, until there are thousands of Jews which believe, and churches spring up all over the Gentile world. It is true, the Holy Spirit had come upon the apostles; but was not the Spirit upon our Lord without measure? The true reason is to be found

Google

in the change in the theme. Christ was not preached before he suffered; after he was glorified, he was. And the crucified Christ, when he is preached, does draw, and will draw, all men unto himself.

My brethren, let us take this apostolic lesson unto ourselves. In these days of sermons, with mere social reform, ethics and politics, what we need most is a revival in our pulpits of the gospel of Jesus Christ—the gospel which is of Jesus, the gospel which is about Jesus, the gospel which is Jesus. We cannot go higher or better than that. What we need to do, first and foremost, is simply to preach Christ. The Apostle Paul felt this. I suppose there was no place where culture the highest and immorality the lowest were more set against him and his message than at Corinth; yet, writing of his work in that very place, he says: "I determined not to know anything among you, but Jesus Christ and him crucified"—"Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God."—And were the great apostle here to-day, his message would be the same.

Our age is called an age of doubt, and we sometimes ask ourselves what will best meet its peculiar needs. My brethren, the best gospel for an age of doubt is the preaching of the living personal Christ. For—to summarize what a recent writer has said most thoughtfully on this subject—first, this is the gospel of a *fact*. Personality is a fact. Our own personalities are the foundation for all our thinking. The personalities of others are the most real things which ever come into our minds. When one meets a stranger, and they find they have a common acquaintance or friend, there is at once a bond of union more real than any other common interest. The man Christ Jesus stands solid and unavoidable as a real person, in human history and in human thought. Christianity did not spring up in the air and create a Christ. A real Christ appeared in the world and created Christianity. What a doubter needs is facts. The gospel of a personal Christ is the gospel of a fact.

It is also, secondly, the gospel of a *force*. The strongest force in this world is personality. What influences you more than anything else is some other person with whom you have come in contact. So in politics, what carries a party to victory is not so much the strength of its platform, as the personal popularity

Digitized by Google

of its candidate. At least one non-Christian religion owes much of its vigor to the personal prominence in it of the founder. Strip our religion of its Christ, and you leave a perfect system indeed, but little power. It was the incarnate, crucified, and resurrected Christ that led the early Church to victory, and he is the Almighty Leader of the Church to-day. The gospel of a personal Christ is the gospel of a force.

It is also, thirdly, the gospel of a *Saviour*. The fundamental fact, after all, in human life is that men are lost. Sooner or later we must feel our sins and our helplessness, and cry out for some living, powerful helper. This need is precisely what Jesus Christ supplies. He is come to seek and to save that which is lost. What we lost men need is not merely some system to believe, but some person to trust. That person is Christ. The gospel of a personal Christ is the gospel of a Saviour.

But how shall we preach Christ? What is it to preach Jesus Christ? Is it to paint the beauty of his life, or to repeat the holy lessons which he taught? It is that, yes, and far more than that.

Notice the use of both names in the text. The name Jesus stands for the human side. The apostles set forth the humanity of our Lord—the man they had known, whom they had seen with their eyes, and their hands had handled, their loving Friend and Teacher, whom the people had taken and crucified, the Son of Man.

The humanity of Christ is a theme which has suffered not so much from unbelief as neglect. Church history tells us that because men lost sight of Christ's human nature, occasion was offered for the worship of Mary. The human heart longs for its Immanuel; and God has met this longing in the person of his Son. Let us not fail to preach. Modern extra-church talkers, realizing this want, exploit Christ too exclusively as a hero, a man, and too often with fledgling shallowness. All the more, then, should the pulpit, with real, thoughtful reverence, preach the humanity of our Lord in fresh reality, with its comforting corollaries of his tasting death for every man, his sympathy, his sinlessness, as set forth in Hebrews.

The name Christ stands for our Lord's *divinity*. The apostles did not fail to preach that. Jesus had partly concealed his

Digitized by Google

divine origin and Messiahship; the apostles, after Pentecost, boldly proclam it. "God hath made this same Jesus whom ye crucified," says Peter; "both Lord and Christ."

The deity of Christ is the citadel of our faith; when that is surrendered, all is gone. It is a prime article of belief in our religion, upon the acceptance or rejection of which depends one's eternal destiny. "The battle rages fierce around the divinity of Christ. Oh, brothers, whom God has solemnly set for the defence of the truth, let us never surrender or fail to proclaim this, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."

The spiritual needs of men may all be classified under three heads: ignorance, guilt, weakness. Jesus Christ in his own person meets these needs, being a prophet for man's ignorance, priest for his guilt, and king for his weakness. Acting economically under the covenant, Christ is the agent of the Godhead (to use a poor human phrase) in making reconciliation; he is also, by reason of his unique relation to the human race, the second Adam, a federal head. Being one with the Father and the Holy Spirit, and at the same time partaker of our nature, he is the only true Mediator, himself the way between God and man.

Here, then, was a person, fully human, fully divine, equipped for man's needs and so related personally as to be the perfect and only Mediator, whom the apostles could offer with confidence to lost men. "Come to Jesus" is their message, for "him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins.

One word in closing. If we are going to teach and to preach Jesus Christ, it will be necessary for us to know him in a very real sense ourselves. "We must study him in the record of his life until his character is more vivid and real to us than that of brother or friend. We must imagine him with ardent soul until his figure glows before our inward sight, and his words sound in our ears as a living voice. We must love with his love, and sorrow with his grief, and rejoice with his joy, and offer ourselves with his sacrifice, so truly, so intensely, that we can say with Paul, that we are crucified with Christ and risen in His resurrection." Remember Jesus Christ as Paul wrote to the young minister Timothy; fill your thoughts full of him; make him in very truth your all in all! As in the lines ascribed to St. Patrick:

Digitized by Google

"Christ with me, Christ before me, Christ behind me, Christ within me, Christ beneath me, Christ above me, Christ at my right, Christ at my left, Christ in the fort, Christ in the chariot seat, Christ in the poop, Christ in the heart of every man who thinks of me, Christ in the mouth of every man who speaks to me, Christ in every eye that sees me, Christ in every ear that hears me."

Let that be our motto. "No day must pass in which we do not do something in Jesus' name, for Jesus' sake. We must go where he would go if he were here on earth. We must try to do what he would do if he were still among men." We *must live the Christ life.* Then, and then only, can we fulfill our ministry, which is to teach and to preach Jesus Christ.

Digitized by Google

THE MINISTER AS A DISSEMINATOR OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

By Rev. Walter L. Lingle, D. D.

First of all, let me give the request which came to me: "There is a matter that I believe ought to be written and published at this time. You doubtless know that our Committee of Publication has been giving away a lot of valuable books. Many of these works are masterpieces; for example, Dr. Palmer's little book, 'The Family,' which Dr. Strickler says is one of the best things Dr. Palmer ever wrote. There are many others that are valuable. Now, it has occurred to me that it is a sad reflection on our Church that the reading tastes should be such that such books as these must be given away in order to be disposed of. These books are not in the homes of our people. Their places are often taken by books of an inferior order, books of mere fiction. Can you not write something along the line of suggestion to pastors and teachers as to the duty of directing the reading of our people, and the ways of doing it? We believe you can, and we hope that you can find the time to do it. We will not limit you as to space."

I have quoted this paragraph not only to show my warrant for consuming time and space, but because it is a splendid little article in itself on the subject, on which the author of it wants me to write. It reveals the trend of at least one seminary student's mind, and we like the trend.

Now, let me make an honest confession. It is that I have not been able to work myself up to a great state of grief about those books which our Publication Committee has been giving away. I have examined the list with some care. There are some valuable books among them. But many of these books have served their day and generation, and have fallen on sleep. Some of them were still-born. It is my observation that if a book does not circulate, the fault is generally with the book—either the world has outgrown the need of it, or there is something defective about the book itself. The defect is often a lack of literary form

Digitized by Google

or style. That is probably the trouble with the majority of books which our Committee is giving away. Books which live owe their life as much to their literary form as they do to their thought. Here is a paragraph which I read last night in a lecture by Dr. Alexander Whyte, on Bunyan's "Grace Abounding." It says for me what I am trying to say: "And, then, there was Bunyan's exquisite style. I have named three men above whose conversion first, and then their after sanctification, stand out beside those of Bunyan in their intense interest to me, and in their deep and continually increasing power over me. But their books are not known outside a very small and a fast-decreasing circle of readers. And that, partly because of the poor and stumbling and repelling style in which they are written. Whereas John Bunyan's 'Grace Abounding' will be read as long as the English language lasts, if only for its incomparably pure, and clear, and strong, and sweet, and winning English style. During my recent holiday, I read the works of two of the most learned theologians of the present and past generations; but, oh! the style! It was harsh and clumsy, and confused, and unintelligible often, and insufferable always. Whereas, when I took up John Bunyan, and read him again—Oh, what grace, what sweetness, what music, what melody! Till I kissed the beautiful book and laughed aloud with joy."

So the fact that some books are being given away by our Committee does not make me take a gloomy view. The fault may be with the book, and not with the people. I take the more comfort when I observe that the writers in our Church who have a message and a literary style have also a wide hearing. What could be more uninviting as a title for a book than "The Creed of Presbyterians," but when the people looked within that little book and saw the grace and charm of the style, and saw that there was a message, it went like wild-fire, and is still selling. I could give other illustrations.

But this has carried me rather far afield from my subject. I am asked to show that it is the duty of the pastor to direct the reading of his people, and also to show how he can do it. Notwithstanding what I have said above, I heartily agree with the one who made this request, that it is the minister's duty to do all he can to disseminate Christian literature and to direct the read-

Digitized by Google

ing of his people. Of course preaching the gospel is the great work of the minister. We must never forget that. Every minister ought to try, by the grace of God, to make his pulpit his throne. But placing a good book in a home is one method of preaching the gospel. Now, I might go on and argue at length that it is the minister's duty to do what he can to place Christian literature in the homes of his people, but I am not going to do this. I will take it for granted that practically every minister believes this already. When we see how much trash and how many positively vicious books there are on the market, and how ignorant many Christians are on the whole subject of Christian literature, and how few books there are of any kind in many Christian homes, we feel that we must do something to bring our people into touch with a world of Christian literature, which means so much to us and which would enrich and enlarge their Christian experience. The minister does not need to be converted on this point. He already feels deeply upon the subject. But the burning question is how can it be done? How can the minister place Christian books and literature in the hands and homes of his people without turning aside from the great work of his ministry to become a book agent or colporteur? I will devote the remainder of this article to an attempt to answer that question. You will have to let me speak out of my own personal experience, as that is the only way I know. Certainly, that is the only way in which I can make this paper of any practical value.

1. He will have to be a reader himself. His people will soon discover whether their pastor knows anything about books. If he does, his counsel will be sought and his recommendations will have weight. If he does not, he will not be able to accomplish a great deal along this line of work. I am afraid that the majority of us who are ministers do not read as much as we ought. Our work is exacting and very hard to systematize. If we do not know how to use the fragments of time, we will certainly not get much reading done. Worse than this, the average minister does not have the money to spare for even the books which he feels are a necessity. I wonder how many of us reach the high standard in the paragraph below, which I have just run across in an article by Dr. Robertson Nicoll, who probably knows more about books than any man in the English-speaking

Digitized by Google

world, and who, his biographer says, averages a book a day the year round: "How much ought I to read every week in order to keep the mind alive? To this I reply that one book a week carefully and thoughtfully read, is enough. When a book is long, two or three weeks may be allowed. My view is that there is no intelligent person, however actively employed, who cannot read, say, 15,000 words every day. This means an hour, perhaps a little more in the case of very slow readers. The average book of to-day is about 100,000 words long. Fifteen thousand words a day will be sufficient to accomplish one book. There are many great books much longer, and of course, more time must be allowed to these. This, I fancy, is a minimum allowance to those who wish to keep their intellect fresh, and bright and clear." If we could but reach this minimum in well-directed reading, our problem would be largely solved. Our people would regard us as authorities on the subject of books and would seek our advice. Besides, we would know what books to recommend. One trouble with us is that our reading is so circumscribed that when a parishioner requests us to suggest a good book, we are embarrassed and cannot really think of one. And woe to the man who recommends books indiscriminately without having read them. He will come to grief sooner or later.

2. A second method by which a minister may direct the reading of his people is by preaching an occasional sermon on the subject of reading. Literature occupies a large place in life, and wields a large influence in the moulding of character. Certainly it is worthy of a place in a sermon. It may be a little difficult to find a suitable text, and I do believe in "textual fidelity" with all my heart. "Till I come, give attendance to reading," is rather ambiguous, but I believe that it is perfectly legitimate to use it. If we are doubtful about that, we might try "The Cloke that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments." Or we might take the story of the burning of the books in Acts xix. 19. I am sure there are wagon-loads of trash to-day which ought to be burned. Others may find better texts than these. Anyway, the minister will find the sermon a very fruitful method of circulating Christian literature. About a year ago I devoted a sermon to this subject. Afterwards I had numbers of requests

Digitized by Google

to recommend good books. One gentleman wrote me a letter and sent me blanks on which to write the names of some fifty books which I thought ought to be in his library. There are a great many who are eager for suggestions of this kind from persons who have a knowledge of books. We scarcely realize how limited the average hearer's knowledge of any kind of literature is, especially his knowledge of Christian literature. It is simply amazing how few books of any description there are in many of our homes. Try a sermon on this subject once in every two or three years.

3. When you strike an especially good book, tell the people about it on Sunday. When I had read Dr. Egbert Smith's "Creed of Presbyterians," I was so charmed that I took it to church on Sunday, held it up and told the people about it. Before the next Sunday I had been requested to order forty copies. Of course, that was a little trouble, but what good thing can you have or accomplish without some trouble? That was five years ago. I may say that I am still ordering copies of that little book. I have ordered five within the last two weeks. I did the same thing with Stalker's "Life of Christ." I suppose I have ordered fifty copies or more of that. About a year ago I tried this plan on the Confession of Faith. I discovered that some of the officers in the church did not have a copy. I had an idea that every officer ought certainly to have one, so I ordered fifty copies to start with, and placed them with an elder. Then I told the people of them on Sunday. They were all taken, and a good many more copies ordered. By the same method, we have placed "Christus Redemptor," a Book on Missions in the South Seas, in forty homes within the past month. If a minister wants to try this plan, he will do well to select a reliable man beforehand, and, after telling the people of the book, tell them that this man will be very glad to take their orders. This will relieve the minister of considerable trouble and keep him from savoring of the book agent, and at the same time give the other man some useful and interesting Christian work to do. But let me say again, the minister must know his book through and through before he recommends it.

4. Still another good way of circulating Christian literature is through the Sunday-school library. Of course, we must have

Digitized by Google

books for children, and plenty of them, but let us have more for adults. Every Sunday-school that has a library ought to have a committee whose business it is to keep a constant look-out for books which are suitable for the library. The pastor might be chairman of that committee. In this way, a few carefully-selected books could be added to the library every month, which is better than dumping in fifty once a year. When the new book comes, let the pastor hold it up before the school and tell the children about it. Or if it is especially suited for adults, he might mention it in his notices on Sunday morning. Those churches which have little papers of their own, ca nalways publish the names of the new books in their paper.

And there is the Missionary library, with all its possibilities. Every church, no matter how poor it is, ought to have one. These are the books that tell of the coming of the kingdom. There is no more thrilling, soul-stirring literature in all the world. It is wonderful how much of this kind of literature a pastor can put into circulation by means of the Missionary library.

5. I have found the much-maligned women's clubs a good medium for the dissemination and study of Christian literature. I have been frequently asked to prepare the programs for the year's study. In this way, one club was led to spend two years in studying the Old Testament and Old Testament literature. Another club took the same course for a year. In this study, some of the best books in connection with the Old Testament were put into circulation and thoroughly studied. Another program embraced a year's study in the Life of Christ. Again, some of the best books on the gospels and the life of Christ were put into a number of hands. I have just recently had the privilege of sketching a year's course on Scotland, in which the club will study John Knox and the Reformation, the Covenanters, David Livingstone, and John G. Paton. This means that a number of books, which we Presbyterians would put in a class with the very best Christian literature, will be studied.

6. There is still another way. The minister is going into the homes of his people daily. He is also reading daily. As he goes into the homes, instead of talking about everything under the sun but religion, let him introduce the Christian book that he is reading, and suggest it as a good one for the home. I

Digitized by Google

think he can do this without seeming pedantic. He will often find it an easy method of turning the conversation from the purely secular to the spiritual, and what minister's heart does not burn within him with a longing to talk of things spiritual?

7. I will mention only one other way. Our church papers and magazines constitute the very best form of religious literature which we can put into the hands of the people. They are fresh. They deal with living themes. I wish that there might be a copy of the *Missionary* and of a good church paper in every home. The minister will do well to make mention of these in the pulpit from time to time, and encourage the people to subscribe for them. He can give no little aid to the representatives of these papers who come to canvass his congregation. He can encourage his missionary society to place a copy of the *Missionary* in every home in the congregation.

But time fails me, and so does space, to tell of all the ways in which a minister, who is dead in earnest about it, may find to place Christian literature in the homes of his people, without turning aside for a moment from his great calling. My little experience leads me to believe that there is no reason to mourn over the depraved tastes of our Christian people, but a reason to rejoice that so many of them are eager for books and papers which have a message for their souls.

Digitized by Google

THE UNITY OF ISAIAH.*

By Rev. Parke P. Flournoy, D. D.

The importance of this book for our times is indicated by its title. This, however, is only suggestive. Its authorship is indicative of its value in a far more satisfactory way. Many defences of the Bible are undertaken by well-meaning but incompetent authors, and are often worse than valueless. Very few ministers or even professors of theology could undertake to answer the criticisms of Driver or Cheyne, for instance, for the reason that very few are specialists on the subjects with which they deal. In Professor Margoliouth, a colleague in the same great University of Oxford, we have a specialist of specialists, who not only knows all the materials with which these and other higher critics have constructed their theories, but who goes beyond them as a specialist in one particular line of great importance in the decision of the questions under discussion. One who knows nothing about Arabic would be guilty of great presumption if he were to undertake to decide as to who was the greatest Arabic scholar in the world; yet, the most unlearned of us might feel pretty sure that a man who was very far below that point of attainment would not be likely to occupy the chair of Laudian Professor of Arabic in Oxford University.

In his preface, Professor Margoliouth tells us: "For much of the matter contained in the following pages, I am indebted to Arabic and Hebrew texts." He adds, that it is "now possible to treat the Old Testament as a part of Arabic literature, just as it has long been possible to treat Hebrew as a dialect of Arabic."

It would be impossible to give, in the space allowed for a book notice, the reasons given in this book for believing in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, the Davidic authorship of the great bulk of the Psalms, the genuineness of Daniel and other books of the Old Testament; but a slight sketch of the argument for the unity of Isaiah may be allowed. The two chief grounds relied on by higher critics for the division of Isaiah, and the assigning of Chapters xl—lxvi to a deutero-Isaiah of post-exilian

*The Unity of Isaiah, from Lines of Defence of the Biblical Revelation. By D. S. Margoliouth, *Laudian Professor of Arabic, Oxford University.* Third Edition. Hodder and Stoughton.

Digitized by Google

times, are the occurrence of Aramaean words in this portion of the book and the calling of Cyrus by name.

As to the first, Professor Margoliouth holds that it would have been entirely possible, and indeed quite natural, for a writer of the time of Hezekiah, and even earlier, to use Aramaean words. He shows us that "in Deborah's song, which is assuredly a very early specimen of Hebrew, there occurs an Aramaism, 'Yethannu,' 'we shall celebrate,'" (Judges v. 11.) The fact is then referred to that Hezekiah's officers requested the Rabshakeh of Sennacherib not to speak to them in the Jew's language, lest the men on the walls of Jerusalem should hear and understand their colloquy, saying: "Speak, I pray thee, to thy servants in the Syrian language; for we understand it." On this the remark is made: "Hence, if Isaiah's oracles were full of Aramaic loan-words, we should have no occasion for surprise. The only Aramaic loan-words that prove anything are words that we can date; and when loan-words known to have been introduced into Aramaic later than 700 B. C. are found in any part of Isaiah, it will be time to pay them due respect."

The opinion of the higher critics that Isaiah could not have foretold the fall of Babylon, and could not have known the name of the king who was to take it, more than a century and a half before the occurrence of the event, would be very reasonable on the supposition that he was not divinely inspired. But, as Professor Margoliouth remarks: "In the case of prophecy we have to deal with a class of literature unrepresented anywhere but in Israel;" and to deny Isaiah's ability to predict these events, is to deny that he was really a prophet, and to imply that the account of his call in the sixth chapter, when he saw our Lord's glory and spoke of him, was not true. It is indeed true that the calling of the name of Cyrus is a mark of particularity and definiteness unusual in prophetical predictions; but it should be remembered that special attention is called to the reason of this in the prophecy itself. The reason is this: "That thou mayest know that I, the Lord, which *call thee by thy name,* am the God of Israel. For Jacob, my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even *called thee by thy name*: I have *surnamed thee* though thou hast not known me." (Isaiah xlv. 3, 4.) In this great crisis of Israel's history this miracle of foreknowledge and divine power over the greatest of kings is brought out again and again.

Digitized by Google

Has not this something to do with the fact that this people, always inclined to idolatry before, regarded it with abhorrence ever after that? This amazing fact in their history is no slight indication that this is a real prophecy by the real Isaiah, and only Isaiah. No post-exilian forgery could have produced such a stupendous change. Again and again, the great contrast is drawn between the false gods and Jehovah who had thus foretold the deliverance from Babylon: "They have no knowledge that set up the wood of their graven image, that pray unto a god that cannot save." . . . . "Who hath declared this from ancient time? Who hath told it from that time? *Have not I, the Lord? and there is no God else besides me; the first God and a Saviour; there is none beside me.*"—(Isaiah xlv. 20, 21.)

Having seen that there is no good reason for the partitioning of the prophecy on this or any other of the schemes suggested by critics, and for assigning the last twenty-seven chapters to a deutero-Isaiah, or to a number of post-exilic authors, let us turn to Professor Margoliouth's reasons for believing in the unity of Isaiah. For all who believe in the plenary inspiration of the New Testament its testimony is sufficient. But, unfortunately, many modern scholars are unwilling to accept this testimony as final. So this treatise goes out to meet the critics on their own ground and presents not only the unbroken tradition of all ages of the unity of the prophecy and the authorship of the Isaiah who prophesied in the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah, but presents the proofs of the unity of the book from the book itself. Little but a succinct summary can be given. The summary is this:

1. External evidence.

2. The division at the end of chapter thirty-nine leads on to many other divisions.

3. The geographical references of Isaiah compared with those of Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

4. The idolatrous practices referred to in the latter as in the earlier portion, not in accordance with post-exilian conditions.

5. The crimes condemned in the last portion the same as those condemned in the first, and could not have belonged to the post-exilian period.

6. Personal details.

7. The second portion has words peculiar to the first, in the peculiar meaning in the first.

Digitized by Google

8. The second has the same scientific and technical vocabulary as the first.

It would be impossible, of course, in a brief review, to present the evidence arranged under all these heads. To give a hint of what is contained under two or three of them, along with more general reasons for belief in the unity of the prophecy, is all that can be done. The sins of the people referred to and rebuked by the prophet in the latter part of the book, appear to be the same sins as are reproved in the earlier part, and in the vrey first chapter. The ungodly living, which made the worship of the people unacceptable to God, as shown in the first chapter, seems to be of the same character as that rebuked in the fifty-ninth, for instance. It would hardly have been said of them in their humbled and chastened condition at the end of the exile, "Their feet run to evil, and they make haste to shed innocent blood." (lix. 7). Their "transgressing and lying against (denying, A. R. V.) the Lord, and departing away from our God," (lix. 13,) can hardly belong so well to the time when idolatry had been entirely given up, as to the time when no influence was sufficient to wean them from it. The charge of drunkenness in lvi. 10-12, recalls the same made in v. 22. Our author remarks: "That the same impeachment could be made with justice at such different periods as the time of the first Isaiah and the close of the exile, or commencement of the return, seems unthinkable." But stranger still would it be to hear the prophet inveighing against mysterious heathenish idolatries among the people at the close of the exile, as we find him doing in lvii. 5 f. "Ye inflame yourselves among the oaks, under every green tree"—and of infanticide in this worship—"that slay the children in the valleys, under the clefts of the rocks."—(A. R. V.)

The use of the word translated "oaks" in the A. R. V., and "idols" in A. V., suggests other bonds, which unite the two parts of the prophecy. The use of the familiar word *"elim"* here, in a sense so peculiar as to defy intelligent translation, is in reference to the same thing referred to in i. 29: "For they shall be ashamed of the oaks which they have desired." The word *gannoth,* gardens, occurs in the same connection, and in both parts of the book. Another word, *Nashath,* is used in a peculiar sense in both parts of the book, (Isa. xix. 5, and xlii. 17.) Professor Margoliouth remarks: "Both parts of Isaiah are acquainted

Digitized by Google

with a verb *nashath* or *nasath*, meaning "to be dry," and, in all probability, identical with a very familiar Arabic word meaning the same." The fact that Jeremiah, at the beginning of the exile uses the same word, (Jer. xviii. 14), but in a different sense, leads to the conclusion that its earlier meaning had by that time been forgotten, but it is used in the earlier sense in both parts of Isaiah.

Another of these words is *Shachar*, in Arabic, "black art." This word is used in both parts of Isaiah, (Isa. viii. 20, and xlvii. 11.) The use of this familiar Arabic word, unused elsewhere in the Scriptures, "seems to me to be a striking mark of identity of period." "Moreover, if the second Isaiah had borrowed the phrase from the first, we could scarcely imagine him handling it so freely as to make a denominative verb from it." The force of this last remark will be felt, I think, by any one who will examine the Hebrew. The use of the peculiar word *noses* (Isa. x. 18, and lix. xix.) is another link. Here our author remarks: "No one save Isaiah appears to know anything of the worship connected with *gannoth* and *elim*, or to know the meaning of the words *nashath*, *shachar* or *noses*." The author of chapters xl.-lxvi., he remarks, claims to be the writer of the earlier part of the prophecy, "and when questioned on these five matters, turns out to know all about them. Whence, it would appear that his claim is just." (p. 131.)

There are some more general reasons which lead Professor Margoliouth to disbelieve in the existence of a second Isaiah. "That two authors of stupendous merit might accidently get bound up together, and so the works of the second be attributed to the first, is exceedingly unlikely, but not so unlikely as to be impossible. In the case of Isaiah, however, not only is the example of the minor prophets decidedly against it, but that of Ezra and Nehemiah still more so. Owing to the similarity of the subjects of which they treat, they appear in several canons under the single head of Ezra; but the Jews, though they probably often bound them up together, never confused them." "The first dissection," he also remarks, "leads to innumerable others." We know that this has been the rather ludicrous result of sawing Isaiah asunder. A division into some forty parts is needed to satisfy the rapacity of some critics.

How unreasonable is the theory of such a division of a book

Digitized by Google

which has, until a comparatively recent date, been recognized by all the world, Jews and Gentiles, as the prophecy of Isaiah, is set forth in the following sarcastic strain. Referring to this age-long acceptance of the book by the whole world, Professor Margoliouth says:

"But that was a childish mistake. What it really had was a patchwork of scraps produced by a number of obscure individuals, so insignificant that posterity thought their names unworthy of record, or so dishonest that they dared not avow them. It is a cento of scraps of that sort that humiliated the literature of Greece and Rome and won Europe for Christ."

This imperfect sketch of a notable book cannot properly be concluded without drawing attention to the author's view of the enormity of the crime of a second Isaiah, if such there could have been: "It must be perceived that the author of chapters xl-lxvi is either a prophet or a great rogue and impostor. The mention by him of the name of Cyrus (xlv) is declared to be a tremendous miracle wrought in order that the whole world, from East to West, might know that Jehovah was the mighty God." This is repeated and insisted on again and again, as the reader of Isaiah sees, and the crime of a forger, who should do this after the event he pretended to have foretold long before, would be one to make an ordinary criminal stand aghast at its heaven-daring enormity. We cannot believe the words "as Esaias saith" could be used in the New Testament in reference to the words of such a reprobate as a post-exilic second Isaiah would assuredly have been. After laying in the balances all that his great colleagues and the other higher critics claim for the division of the prophecy of Isaiah, Professor Margoliouth finds it utterly wanting. It should encourage us who may not be able to fully understand, and much less to answer in detail their learned arguments to hear one who can so ably do both, saying: "Is there, then, nothing in the splitting theories? To my mind, nothing at all."

BETHESDA, MD.

Digitized by Google

IN JESUS' STEAD.

2 *Cor. IV.* 7-12.

REV. ALFRED JONES, D. D.

The surprises of Scripture never cease. Instead of this, they seem to increase in number and richness. As an example of this, we read, in 2 Cor. iv. 10: "Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body." This seems to declare that the Lord Jesus continued to live and die in the person of the Apostle Paul. Such a suggestion as this is so extraordinary that one naturally begins to search the Scriptures in order to see whether or not such thoughts are presented elsewhere. The surprise is heightened by the number of the passages which intimate that all genuine Christians occupy a position on earth somewhat like that of our Lord while in his incarnate state. As an example of this, we read in 1 John iii. 16: "Hereby perceive we love because he laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." Here is an assertion that we ought to lay down our lives for the kingdom of God because he laid down his life for it. Rom. viii. 17, seems to draw us still closer, when it says: "If so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together." Rom. xii. 1, teaches a like thought: "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." This passage urges us to give our mortal lives to God, as Christ gave his. 2 Cor. i. 5, further identifies us (Paul at least) with Christ, in suffering: "For as the sufferings of Christ abound in us." 2 Cor. xii. 15, affords another parallel: "I will gladly spend and be spent for you." This is Christlike. Perhaps Gal. ii. 20, should also be cited: "I am crucified with Christ." Gal. vi. 17 is more impressive: "From henceforth let no man trouble me: for I bear in my body the mark of the Lord Jesus." The scars in his body, received by being beaten and stoned, for Jesus' sake, Paul calls "the marks of the Lord Jesus." Phil. i. 21 is very suggestive: "For me to live is Christ." In accordance with this thought, he expresses his desire in verse 20 that Christ may be magnified in his body, whether it be by life or death. To like effect is Phil. ii. 17: "Yea,

Digitized by Google

and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all." Phil. iii. 9. 10 expresses a wonderful identification with the Saviour: "And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith: That I might know him, and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death." Col. i. 24 continues and heightens these teachings: "Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ, in my flesh, for his body's sake, which is the Church." This seems to say, that when Christ died on Calvary, his sufferings were not ended; but that some were left to be completed by his people. Col. i. 27 gives us the expression "Christ in you, the hope of glory." Moses realized the identification of Christ and his people, as we see from Heb. ii. 26, for he esteemed the "reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt." In First Peter ii. 21, we read: "For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example ,that ye should follow in his steps. Finally we read in 1 Pet. iv. 12-14 "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you: but rejoice inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy. If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye, for the Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you: on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified."

With this very considerable citation of parallel Scriptures, let us now return to the consideration of our text, 2 Cor. iv. 7-12. The first thought, presented in verse 7, is that the gospel is as a treasure contained in earthen vessels. Preachers are but men, erring, imperfect, mortal. God means to have it so. The contrast between the message and the messenger is so great; and the fruits of the message are so great that God receives the glory. In order to set forth this thought, the apostle adds concerning himself that he is troubled on every side, yet not distressed; perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed. In other words, he realizes his weakness, frailty and mortality, yet along with all these he recognizes his support and identification with the Lord Jesus; for he

Digitized by Google

immediately adds that he is always bearing about in his body the dying of the Lord Jesus. This is nothing less than an identification of himself with the Lord Jesus. Somehow, Paul's sufferings for Christ's sake were Christ's sufferings in his person. As Paul was wearing out in his ministry it was Christ continuing his dying in Paul's person. The Lord's death was continued in him. This marvelous teaching is somewhat explained by 1 Cor. xii. 13: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." Christ and the saved have a vital connection. But it is not only true that Christ continued to die in Paul, but also to live in him; for the same tenth verse continues: "that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body." He was drawing out the death of Jesus in order that he might manifest the life of Jesus. Jesus not only laid down his life on the cross, but laid it down day by day during his whole earthly life-time, giving it, day by day, to God and the Church. Paul, a member of the body of Christ, continued the life of Christ in the same cause, and for the same purpose. Thus were Christ's life and the death manifested in Paul's body.

We find this thought still further heightened in verse 11: "For we which live are always delivered unto death, for Jesus' sake." Not only did Paul bear about in his body the dying of the Lord Jesus, but he was delivered for the purpose. When he was stoned at Lystra, he was delivered to be stoned. When he was beaten at Philippi, he was delivered to be beaten. When he was mobbed at Jerusalem, he was delivered to be mobbed. And when he was executed at Rome, he was delivered to be executed. Moreover, all this came to pass in order "that the life of Jesus might be made manifest in his mortal flesh." He was placed in all these positions in order that he might manifest the Spirit of Christ and do the work of Christ in these several places and relations among men.

The result of all this was a most glorious one, as stated in verse 12: "So then death worketh in us but life in you." Paul laid down his life, day by day, until it was all laid down. As he did so, souls were made alive in Christ. Death wrought in Paul, but produced life (by the work of the Spirit) in his hearers. Those who were thus quickened, became, in turn, workers for Christ, laying down their lives, whereby others were quickened. And so the work went on and still goes on; one set

Digitized by Google

of workers for Christ lay down their lives, giving the gospel. This is used of God to quicken another company, who, in turn, become workers, laying down their lives for the kingdom.

From all these wonderful teachings, we may do well to note a variety of lessons. The first class of lessons to be noted may be called *The Position and Privileges of Christians.*

1st. We have a vital spiritual union with Christ. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles." 2nd. We represent Christ. Like Paul, we beseech men to become reconciled to God. We bear his message. We represent his kingdom. We bear about in our bodies his death, and by his grace we manifest his life. 3rd. It is our privilege to suffer with and for him. We live where he locates us. We experience what he sends us. We receive joy or sorrow, sickness or health, poverty or wealth, with the assurance that the Lord is our shepherd and that he causes all things to work for our good. And finally, under this head, it is our privilege to be conformed unto his death. That is, we are to give each day of our lives to his service, until all have been given, and then, in faith, to commend our souls into his hands, with whatever kind of departure he may send us.

Next in order, let us note some of the *Duties Assigned Us.*

1st. We are to manifest the Spirit of Christ under all the circumstances under which we may be placed. What would Jesus do if placed under my circumstances, is ever a pertinent question to be asking. And our lives should be conformed to the true answer in every case. This is a most solemn duty. We are Christ's only visible representatives on earth. We are bound to act like him. 2nd. Very closely allied with this duty is that of living and dying for him daily. Each day we spend is given to something. We, his sworn servants, are in duty bound to give each day to him, until it has all been given to him.

Once more, we must note among the lessons here presented *The Comforts of Christians.* First, among those, let us note the great comfort of knowing that our Lord sends us all that comes to us. He is our Shepherd, infinite in vigilance, wisdom, love and power. Consequently our circumstances are the best which could possibly attend us. A second comfort for us is that we are advancing his kingdom. If any one should question this in his own case, let him ask and answer two questions: Am I a

Digitized by Google

child of God? and am I living faithfully for his glory? If he can answer both of these in the affirmative, he must know that he is advancing the glory of God, even though he may lack the evidence of his own usefulness. A third comfort for the Christian lies in the fact that he is to become conformed to his likeness, the labors, trials, chastisements, life and death sent him by his Lord work to this end. Moreover, he is to be satisfied when he awakes in Christ's likeness. The final comfort held out before the Christian is that if he suffers with Christ he shall also reign with him. "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne." Surely this is enough of comfort for God's children here.

The following verses have been written to express some of these delightful thoughts:

Eternal, with the Father,
  Dwelt God's beloved Son;
Divine, co-equal, blessed;
  Surpassed in heaven by none.
Moved with divine compassion,
  The veiled divinity
In mortal flesh, like sinners,
  Their captive souls to free.

His days he filled with service,
  For all the chosen seed;
A righteousness completed,
  Such as poor, lost men need.
He lived a life of dying;
  Giving each passing day
To God, the church, and wand'rers,
  While showing them the way.

His life went out on Calv'ry:
  His spirit went to God:
He left behind His members,
  To tread the path he trod.
Such is our union with Him;
  Such is our mission here;
Such is our high position;
  We occupy His sphere.

Digitized by Google

Assigned to this position,
  By Jesus' wondrous grace,
We magnify our calling,
  And live here in His place.
As He died daily for us,
  We die for sinful flesh;
Each manifesting Jesus,
  Imperfect, but afresh.

One Spirit, God's own Spirit;
  Union with Christ our Lord;
All soldiers of His kingdom;
  All heralds of His word.
Great Spirit, raise us higher!
  Consume us at our task!
To live for God, His kingdom
  And man, is all we ask.

Digitized by Google

INDIA'S NEED.

By W. M. Forrest.

Professor of Biblical History and Literature in the University of Virginia.

India's need is the more abundant life that our Lord came into the world to grant to man. Everywhere the struggle of man is for life—more life. Almost from the cradle to the grave, we are engaged in a battle for physical life. Our farms and factories, our banks and business houses exist for the sake of our physical necessities. Our hospitals, health resorts and physicians are supported to help us get a little longer and better life.

Man, however, cannot be satisfied with mere existence. Great mysteries surround him in earth and sea and sky; mighty problems of life and destiny crowd upon him. He is so endowed that he hungers after the intellectual power to deal with such questions. Everywhere myths and folk-tales, or science and philosophy bear witness to this fact. Every school and college, and book and library is a monument testifying to man's love of the life of the mind. Nor does the desire for physical and intellectual well-being exhaust the subject of man's vital needs. No tribe or people has been found without a religion. Man is, indeed, "incurably religious." His soul can never be satisfied until he shall awake with God's likeness. Smoking altars, bleeding sacrifices, temples, churches, prayer, penance, praise—all proclaim aloud the longing of humanity for the life of the soul. If one will listen intently enough, down beneath whatever is superstitious, and crude, and even sinful in the world's religions, one may hear the cry of the human heart for God.

In this love of a manifold life the people of India differ in no respect from the people of Christendom. But in Christian lands it is the rule, and not the exception, for those who earnestly strive for life to obtain it. Here in America an honest effort to get a fair share of the good things of physical life is quite uniformly successful. An attempt to gather the ripe fruits of culture need seldom be a failure. And the man who seeks after God finds him, and the peace of God which passeth all understanding comes into his heart, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Digitized by Google

When we overstep the bounds of Christendom and enter a land like India, where Bible, Church, and Christ are in no important degree regulative, we find all this sadly reversed. There it is the exception, and not the rule, for men to become prosperous, no matter what their industry and frugality. It is the exception, and not the rule, for them to get an education, however much capacity and desire for it they may possess. And, sadly enough, it is the exception and not the rule for them to attain to any knowledge of God that can purify the soul and satisfy the heart, seek they never so earnestly after it. A consideration of the present social and religious status of India abundantly confirms these statements. The conditions of physical life in India are pitifully hard. Men work as trained household servants for wages ranging from $2.00 to $5.00 a month. From that sum they provide their own food and the support of their families. Unskilled laborers are paid from 2 cents to 10 cents a day. Carpenters, masons, and the like, who receive anywhere from $2.00 to $5.00 a day in America, get 25 cents a day in India. The average annual income per capita is from $6.00 to $8.00. The great majority of the people are agriculturists, yet a comfortable farm-house could not be found in the land. The people live in little villages near their small fields. Their huts are of bamboo and mud, with earth floor, and straw or cheap tile roof. Without carpet, chairs, tables, they are so devoid of the bare necessities of life that an American farmer would consider them unfit to house his stock.

India's farmers use implements of which Abraham might have been ashamed four thousand years ago. A crooked stick for a plow, a bunch of thorns tied to the tail of an ox for a harrow, a primitive sickle for a reaper, the hoofs of oxen for threshers, the winds of the earth to drive away the chaff. Thus equipped, taking such poor seed as the village money-lender chooses to supply, burdened with debt, and renting his land at high rates, how could he get a fair share of life? Such conditions keep the masses upon the ragged edge of starvation all the time. It is estimated that 40,000,000 people in India never know what it is to get enough to eat. Some say there are always 80,000,000 of such. That means a population as large, or half as large, as that of the United States, who struggle on from miserable birth to premature death without knowing how it feels to satisfy the demands of hunger.

Digitized by Google

Because of this poverty and the lack of sanitation and medical care, the land is scourged by disease. Famine augments it. It is estimated that in spite of all relief measures, the latest great famine caused 1,000,000 deaths. Fevers slay about 5,000,000 persons yearly, and cholera 500,000. Bubonic plague has raged for years, daily sweeping away hundreds. There are about 100,000 lepers roaming around the country, and over 250,000 blind persons. Thus are the people of India beaten back and defeated in their struggle for physical life.

Amid such wretchedness adequate intellectual life is an impossibility. India's masses live under the blight of total illiteracy. After years of effort by government and missionaries, more than 277,000,000 of the population are unable to read and write. With 144,000,000 females in the country, 143,000,000 are illiterate. About 12½ per cent. of the children of school-going age are now in school; only 2½ per cent. of the girls of school-going age are being educated. Yet they are not a people without intellectual capacity. They are members of the same proud Aryan race to which belong the great nations of Europe and America. Their languages are rich, their literature beautiful, their philosophy profound. Nevertheless they cannot sweeten their toil by holding converse with the choice and master minds of all the ages through the printed page. The pleasant and profitable avenues opened up by education for us and our children are hopelessly blocked for them. Here, again, are they thwarted in their desire for life.

What is the result of their endeavor to attain spiritual life? They are intensely religious. To say nothing of numerous other faiths, the Hindu pantheon has 333,000,000 gods. Every city abounds in temples; under almost every tree, and at every crossroad may be found a shrine containing some grotesque object of worship. A sacred city like Benares is full of temples, and every temple court is always thronged with pilgrims. They go there from near and far, in excess of zeal often measuring off every foot of the way with their bodies prostrate in the dust, like veritable human measuring-worms. Some lie with naked bodies upon beds of spikes. Others sit beneath the burning, tropical sun with the five sacred fires burning about them. Yet others stare with unveiled face at the blazing sun until they are blinded for life, or hold arm or leg in one cramped position so long that it becomes atrophied and can never again be moved.

Digitized by Google

Why do the people undergo those toils and pains? Surely not for sport and holiday past-time. Such things proclaim intense earnestness; an effort to be eased of the burden of sin, to store up merit for a future life, to find peace with God. But, in spite of it all, the struggling souls fail of the life of the spirit that they seek. Their leaders and teachers—priests, holy men, sages, philosophers—have been blind leaders of the blind. Or they have been hireling shepherds, come but for to kill, to steal, and to destroy.

Seekers after God have been told they can find no more of him than exists in idols and ceremonies. Enquirers concerning the way of life have been instructed to give up all hope, and aspiration, and desire, and thought, that they may lose themselves in the soul of the universe. For the supreme god of Hindu philosophy is not a personal, loving Father, but an impersonal, unthinking, unloving It. So when India asks for bread, she is given a stone; when she cries for life, she is stunned into silence by a message of death. Surely it was for such a people as this that the Lord Christ came into the world. Of old, he found his people oppressed, and poor, and ignorant, and alienated from God. Yet he did not condemn them to despair and death. In the thick of the throng of the temple court he stretched out his hands in invitation, and lifted up his voice and cried in the ears of all the people: "I am come that you might have life, and that you might have it more abundantly."

Most graciously has that good promise been fulfilled with the passing of the centuries. It is not by accident that the conditions of physical life are easiest and happiest in Christian lands. Neither is it by chance that the light of learning has always followed the light of the cross, making possible schools for all the people. Nor has it merely happened that only where the gospel is preached do men find their way unto their heavenly Father and the deep comforts of his love. Our own ancestors once lived under the deadening influence of heathenism and the consequent curse of poverty, disease and sin. Only when Christ's servants left the countries that he had redeemed and carried his evangel to our forefathers were they saved to the joys of the more abundant life. In all the rich heritage of our physical, and intellectual, and spiritual well-being we are heirs of the early missionaries who took the gospel to Europe.

Digitized by Google

The knowledge of these facts lays a heavy obligation upon us to Christianize India. She is not beyond redemption. What Christ has done for us, he can do for her. Uuder the inspiration of a Christian hope, her people will awake to a new life. Little by little, better social, industrial and sanitary conditions may be created. Poverty, and disease, and ignorance, and sin may be constantly reduced in Asia as they have been in Europe. Even with a hopelessly inadequate force of missionaries and an altogether insufficient supply of money, a great work has been done in India since the days of William Cary. A Christian community of 3,000,000 souls has been gathered together. It is the only community in India that has broken the shackles binding it to a dead past and a blank despair. It is facing the future with growing hope and confidence; the light of victory is in its eyes. But what are these among the 300,000,000 inhabitants of the land? As yet they could not maintain themselves alone, much less Christianize the masses of their kinsmen. It is claimed that nine-tenths of the people have never yet heard of Jesus in a way that could make them responsible for rejecting him. How, then, can they enjoy the blessings of the life that only Christ can give? The one hope for the present generation rests with this generation of Christian people. Let us not the lamp of life deny.

The present missionary force in India is confronted by the task of evangelizing one-fifth of the entire human race. Daily beholding the evidences of the people's desperate need, they are praying for reinforcements that will make possible the meeting of that need. Their modest request is for a fourfold increase of their numbers, that there may be one missionary to every 25,000 of the people. With such a force, and the native helpers raised up, they hope to give every one in India a chance to become a Christian. Dare the present generation of Christians face the judgment bar of Christ without giving this generation of Indians an opportunity for life? Too long has the Church delayed its saving work. No promptness now can help those who have been coming and going for many generations from death unto death. Even though we answer the call with what speed we may, it will be long before the terrible condition of the country can be changed. Then with penitence for the past, and sorrow for the present; and with gratitude for what the gospel has done for us,

Digitized by Google

and thanksgiving for an opportunity to pass it on to others, let us pour out our treasure and our lives for India's redemption. Then will the day come and not tarry when the people sitting in darkness shall see a great light, for the Sun of Righteousness shall arise upon them with healing in his wings. Then shall they who are sitting beneath the shadow of death stand up and shout for joy, for they shall hear One crying and unto all the people: "I am come that you might have life, and have it more abundantly."

Digitized by Google

UNION SEMINARY MAGAZINE.

EDITORIAL STAFF.

DAVID HOPKINS ROLSTON, *Editor.*

ALFRED S. ANDERSON, *Associate Editor.* S. MC. P. GLASGOW, *Associate Editor.*
GASTON BOYLE, *Missionary Editor.* LYLE MOORE MOFFETT, *Associate Missionary Editor*

PROF. W. W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D., *Review Editor.*
PROF. T. C. JOHNSTON, D. D., LL. D., *Review Editor.*
THOMAS W. HOOPER, Jr., *Book Editor.*
HUGH H. HUDSON, *Business Manager.*

Published bi-monthly during the Seminary session by the students of Union Theological Seminary, in Virginia.

Change of address, discontinuance, or failure to receive the Magazine regularly should be reported promptly by mail to the Business Manager.

Terms: One dollar a year, in advance; single copy, twenty-five cents.

Editorial.

Judging from recent reports of Committees on Ministerial Education, to Synods and Presbyteries, and from discussions of them in various church papers, it seems that the need of more men in the ministerial force of the Church is being sorely felt. There have been some valuable suggestions as to the ways of meeting this need, and these will doubtless bear much fruit. There is another suggestion, which we have heard presented in one of our class rooms several times, which seems to us to be so practical that it ought to be presented to all our pastors and sessions. The week is just past, during which prayers were offered especially for the young men in the various schools in our land, and doubtless there was a great volume of petitions going up to the Lord of the harvest to call, from among these, laborers into his harvest. The plan that we mention commends itself, in that it adds practice to prayer.

According to the Scripture, one of the elements of the call to the ministry, or rather one of the channels through which it comes, is the voice of the brethren. Paul writes to Timothy: "And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." (2 Tim. ii. 2.) The Church has provided

Digitized by Google

theological seminaries well equipped for this committing the gospel to these faithful men. But they must be hunted out and sent up to these halls of instruction in order that they may be instructed. This is a part of the task the the pastors and sessions can help to perform. Certainly there are many of these faithful men in the congregations. If the pastors and session would look over the congregation, and after due consideration and prayer call these faithful men before them and tell them that it seems to them that they ought to undertake the work of the ministry, it would bring many earnest, faithful Christian men face to face with the question in a most telling manner.

Synods and Presbyteries instruct pastors to preach on the subject. Now, if on the Lord's Day, when the subject is presented, the session would meet after the service and take some such action as is above suggested, of course modified to meet existing conditions as common sense may demand, would not that congregation be a splendid example of the fruitful hearers of the Word?

This is certainly not beyond the sphere of the session. One of their functions is that of discipline. Certainly if Christ has commanded his Church to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, and there are not enough men going to fill the vacant pulpits of churches already planted, then there are some where in the Church, men, and not a few of them, who are disobeying the Lord in no trivial matter. Then does it not become those who are set as under shepherds over these to try by all right means to stir them up to do their duty?

The plan suggested will deal with the difficulty at close range and in a most practical manner; it will strike at the root of the trouble; it will bring many young men of the Church to such a consideration of the claims of the ministry upon them as they have never given it before, and no doubt many of these would offer themselves to fill the depleted ranks of the ministry.

The editorial staff has planned to make the last issue of this volume of *The Union Seminary Magazine* a strong number, dealing with the subject of the offices of deacon and elder. There will be discussions from some of the ablest writers of our Church on the various phases of the subject, that will be of interest and

Digitized by Google

profit to every serious-minded deacon and elder in the whole Church. It will not be all from the preacher's standpoint, either, for we have already secured promises of contributions on live topics from some of the eminent laymen of the Church, so both sides will be heard from. By the time we go to press with the next issue, we shall be able to announce the authors and their subjects, and thus give our readers some idea of what we hope to do with that issue. We can plan and secure the contributions and print them, but unless they reach those for whom they are written, not much good will be accomplished. We ask our subscribers to help forward the usefulness of that fourth issue by calling the attention of their brother officers to it so that they may secure copies of it for themselves. The extra copies can be ordered from the business manager by those who are not subscribers. The order should be in the hands of the business manager before the issue goes to the press, in order that none need be disappointed. We shall have something further to say of this in our next issue.

We count ourselves fortunate in this issue. From Aberdeen, across the water, Dr. Stalker sends us an article on George Buchanan, the Scottish humanist, that our readers will enjoy. Dr. Vaughan presents the first part of an able discussion of a classic that has doubtless baffled many of us who have not been able to give it as careful consideration as Dr. Vaughan has given it. Our readers will be glad to let him take them by the hand and lead them through it on firm ground. Dr. Johnson's pen favors us again with the first part of a valuable historical paper that we shall want to read and preserve for consultation in the future.

Perhaps the most practical article in the magazine is that by Dr. Lingle. It will be read by many who will act on its suggestions, and thus do great good in the way of directing the reading of Christian people along wholesome lines.. We are certainly very grateful to all the contributors to this issue. There are more good things in sight for next time, and on the whole, we think we are in a position to say that the whole volume will be a valuable addition to our current literature.

Digitized by Google

The field of polemics is ever a tempting one. But there are many grave dangers therein. Many good men have shown themselves in a bad light in the heat of debate, and have afterwards sincerely regretted it. But men should not stand back from speaking out on the side of what seems to them to be the truth. The discussions, however, should be confined to the principles at issue, and not to the advocates of them. In looking over the pages of past issues of *The Union Seminary Magazine* we find that it has never been the organ of fierce polemics of any kind. We shall endeavor to maintain the precedent thus established. For live issues we have a place. For discussions of great principles, we have time to examine them, and from the best to publish so much as our space will allow. For personal polemics, that so easily and naturally descend into evil speaking, we have nothing but the waste basket. D. H. R.

Digitized by Google

Books.

REVIEW STAFF.

PROF. JOHN I. ARMSTRONG, Kirkwood, Ga.

REV. EGBERT W. SMITH, D. D., Greensboro, N. C.

REV. A. A. MCGEACHY, Sherman, Texas.

REV. HARRIS E. KIRK, D. D., Baltimore, Md.

PROF. THOS. C. JOHNSON, D. D., LL. D., Richmond, Va.

PROF. C. C. HERSMAN, D. D., LL., D., Richmond, Va.

PROF. W. W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D., Richmond, Va.

REV. D. P. MCGEACHY, Lenoir, N. C.

REV. WALTER L. LINGLE, Rock Hill, S. C.

REV. RUSSELL CECIL, D. D., Richmond, Va.

REV. R. E. VINSON, D, D. Austin, Texas.

REV. T. M. LOWRY, D. D., Knoxville, Tenn.

REV. THERON H. RICE, D. D., Atlanta, Ga.

PROF. G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D., Richmond, Va.

PROF. THOS. R. ENGLISH, D. D., Richmond, Va.

PROF. J. G. MCALLISTER, D. D., Hampdan-Sidney, Va.

Any book noticed in these pages may be had at publishers' prices through the Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va.

REVIEWS.

THE LIFE OF JOHN WESLEY. *By C. T. Winchester, Professor of English Literature in Wesleyan University.* 300 pages, $8.00. New York: The Macmillan Company. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd.

The author finds his justification for adding another to the biographies of Wesley, in the fact that "the early biographers, except Southey, and most of the later ones, have written as Methodists for Methodists." He professes that, while moved by the heartiest sympathy for the great religious movement set agoing by Wesley, he aspires to consider Wesley's work "without narrowing denominational bias" and to "emphasize certain phases of his character that have often received comparatively no attention." We are not sure that Professor Winchester succeeds in writing without denominational bias. Many pages in his book indicate the contrary. Take, for example, the following words from p. 209, in which he is closing his account of the controversy between the Wesleyans and the Calvinists:

"It was the best result—perhaps it was the only good result—of the whole controversy that it committed Wesleyan Methodism definitely and

Digitized by Google

unalterably to an Arminian theology. And it will not be denied that to the influence of Wesleyan Methodism, on both sides of the Atlantic, is due in no small degree, the almost universal abandonment of that merciless logic which reads in the will of God the denial of the human will, and the absolute, irrecoverable doom before their birth of a great majority of the human race. It is the demand of ultimate reason that we should insist, at cost of whatever logical inconsistency, upon a God of justice and of love. Only such a God can men love and worship."

These are not the words of a sober historian of any school. They contain a gross caricature of the historic Calvinistic notion of God—a caricature that no fair-minded partisan should allow himself to make. It would be a relief to know that it was made in sheer ignorance.

Other of his aspirations seem to have been more perfectly realized. He gives us, in his modest volume, a fresh and interesting account of the man, the English patriot, and the religious leader. He had a noble subject. Wesley was one of the great servants of God and man in his century.

THOMAS C. JOHNSON.

THE WORK OF PREACHING. A Book for the Class-room and Study. *By Arthur S. Hoyt, D. D., Professor of Homiletics and Sociology in the Auburn Theological Seminary.* New York: The Macmillan Company. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd. 1905.

The list of books treating of the subject of Homiletics is already a formidable one, and still it grows. When we call to mind the fact that preaching is the prime function of the ministry, it is not at all strange that there should be a constant demand for fresh light upon a topic of such vital interest. While the fundamental principles involved are the same from age to age, yet the application of those principles varies with ever-changing conditions, and a work on Homiletics needs to be up-to-date as well as any other. Many "masters in Israel" have treated this subject, and yet there is always "room for one more." No teacher of Homiletics, it is safe to say, has ever yet found a text book on this subject that is altogether satisfactory (unless he has written it himself), and it is rather suggestive that this work by the Professor of Homiletics in Auburn Seminary should follow so closely upon the heels of a similar work by the Professor of Homiletics in Rochester Seminary.

It is quite the fashion in certain quarters to decry the whole subject of Homiletics, and the claim is often made that before a man can preach, he has first to unlearn all that he has been taught in the seminary on that subject. It is very noticeable, however, that these would-be critics never offer any substitute for that which they so glibly condemn. With reference to all such, we feel like saying with Job: "Oh . . . that mine adversary had written a book!" The impression produced by all such critics is that, in their judgment, preaching is neither an art nor a science, but a hap-hazard, irrational way of accomplishing the desired end. Surely if there are laws of thought and feeling, there must be principles which underlie our attempts to move men, and it behooves us

Digitized by Google

to search them out. The truth is that a student often fails to grasp the first principles of the science, and, contenting himself with certain mechanical rules, attempts to turn out sermons with the most disastrous results, and thus invokes condemnation upon the system which is supposed to be responsible for such results.

Returning now to the volume before us, we are glad to be able to pronounce a favorable judgment upon it. It is fresh and readable from start to finish, and when once you begin to read, you are apt to go on to the end. There is nothing new nor startling in it, but simply a new and forcible statement of old truths. It is conservative, but its conservativeness is not that of the "moss-back." As stated in the title, it is intended "for the class-room and for the study," but in our judgment, it is better adapted to the study, than to be used as a text-book for the class-room. For this latter purpose we want a book dealing with principles, rather than one which is readable and instructive.

We have never found Dabney's Sacred Rhetoric particularly attractive as literature, nor would we recommend it as light reading for a leisure hour, reminding us, as it does, of some work on chemistry, bristling with formulae, but for all that, we have found nothing superior to it as a text-book for laying the foundations of the noble art of preaching. We apprehend that this work will accomplish most in the hands of the busy pastor, being full of practical hints and helpful suggestions. In this connection, we venture to make the suggestion that every one engaged in the active work of the ministry should, from time to time, read carefully books on this subject. We know of nothing more helpful to the preacher who desires to grow, and we would like to see this book in the hands of every minister in the land. T. R. ENGLISH.

BOOK NOTES.

THE PROBLEMS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT CONSIDERED WITH REFERENCE TO RECENT CRITICISM. *By James Orr, D. D., Professor of Apologetics and Systematic Theology, United Free Church College, Glasgow.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1906.

Mr. William Bross, of Chicago, did a most important benefaction, when, in 1879, he handed over, to the "Trustees of Lake Forrest University," forty thousand dollars, the accumulated income of which during any one decade, was to be used during the succeeding decade, for the purpose of stimulating the production of the best books on treatises *"on the connection, relation and mutual bearing of any practical science, or history of our race, or the facts in any department of knowledge, with and upon the Christian religion."*

Digitized by Google

The book before us is the third in the "Bross Library" which has been issued, the first having been "Obligatory Morality," by Francis L. Patton, D. D., LL. D., (not yet published), and the second, "The Bible: Its Origin and Nature," by Marcus Dodds, D. D.

Professor Orr does not profess to be an expert in Biblical criticism, but believing that the time is past when the discussion of Old Testament questions could be left to professional experts, he has long been studying the output of the critical schools and especially of the Grat-Wellhausen School, now in the ascendant. While professing indebtedness to this school, he is persuaded that the hypothesis of the school "rests on erroneous principles, is eaten through with subjectivity, and must, if carried to its logical issues—to which, happily, very many do not carry it—prove subversive of our Christian faith, and of such belief in, and use of, the Bible as alone can meet the needs of the living Church."

He conducts his examination of the critical processes and results with great skill, ability and thoroughness. It is not too much to say that he utterly undermines many postulates of the nationalistic criticism, mercilessly exposes the illogical and irrational processes, of which the school is so commonly guilty, and remorselessly shows the utter and absolute worthlessness of many of its boasted conclusions.

The vastly larger portion of this compact volume, of 562 pages, is devoted to destructive criticism of the critics of the extremer schools. This portion is proximately adequate to its purpose. It is a book that should be widely read in an age in which the drift has been very largely toward these arrogant and pretentious schools. We like this part of the book all the better, because it covers almost precisely the ground, which, after a session's work under Dr. Wm. R. Harper, at Yale, we ourselves desired to cover in a volume of like purpose. In the constructive portion of the book—that, in which he sets forth his notion of the way in which the books of the Pentateuch particularly arose, we do not find so much to commend. It seems to us to concede too much to the critics, to concede too little of the Pentateuch to immediate Mosaic authorship, less than the premises established in other parts of the book warrant. The author's style is good; sometimes keen and caustically witty, always strong, direct and clear. He delights in impaling the over-confident critics, of all sizes, from Wellhausen, down to Henry Preserved Smith. This latter *preserved* gentleman he puts into pickle over and over again.

THOS. C. JOHNSON.

Digitized by Google

THE

Union Seminary Magazine

VOL. XVIII FEBRUARY—MARCH, 1907 No. 3

THE TRINITY.

BY REV. SAMUEL SPAHR LAWS, A. M., M. D., D. D., LL. D.

Why should this be looked on as one of the most mysterious, unintelligible, and least practical doctrines of the Christian religion? This is a mistake. On the contrary, it is one of the most obviously intelligible, and intensely practical.

This paper, brief as it must be, proposes to make that appear, allowing for the limitation, with reasonable certainty; and that, too, by a strictly scientific method.

All the laws of nature, which are its doctrines, rest on inductions upon the facts of nature. All the doctrines of the Bible, wrought into the creeds of christendom, are presumed to be inductions on the facts—the verbal utterances—of the Bible. As Nature is and must be recognized as of ultimate and unquestioned authority in the one case, so the Bible must be in the other. Without this, neither secular science, nor Christian Theology can attain creditable standing. No one acquainted with the half-dozen radically distinct systems of philosophy which have gone to record, would dare assert that the objective validity of the so-called facts of nature has not been and is not now denied as stoutly as the most rampant infidelity, has ever repudiated the truthfulness and validity of the so-called facts of the Bible. The nihilism of philosophy is, in the domain of nature, the analogue of atheism in the domain of religion.

But induction, in all cases, leads only to inferential and contingent knowledge; and all inferential knowledge is faith knowledge. This is true even of the universality of the law of gravitation. Hence, unquestionably, the laws of nature as really

Digitized by Google

rest on faith, ultimately, as do the doctrines of the Bible. As matter of fact, theologians proceeded inductively in dealing with the content of the Bible long before scientists thus dealt with nature. It is not true that induction originated with Lord Bacon; Professor Huxley says that the sciences would be just where they are had Bacon never lived. I confidently venture the affirmation that the *Dictum de omni aut nullo* of Aristotle rested with him on induction. But it was not then so thoroughly practiced as now. And for a crowning proof of its application in Biblical work in the past, go to the writings of Augustine, (420 and Calvin 1564, A. D.), and it will be found that as few of their errors have required correction by subsequent investigators as of former by subsequent scientists. Much of the present parade about the new-born scientific study of the Bible is babbling pretence, without due warrant.

The doctrine of the Trinity rests on Biblical induction, and has been accepted by every branch of the Christian Church as a settled doctrine for more than twelve hundred years. The agitation and final formulation of this doctrine, based on a minute investigation of all parts of the Bible, chiefly occupied the thought of the Christian Church during the first seven centuries of the Christian era. However, it is no part of the present purpose to enter otherwise than incidentally either into the history or the metaphysics of the trinitarian controversy, but to confine attention to the plain, practical teaching of the Bible on the subject as a matter of fact.

It is proposed to submit seven distinct Biblical propositions, or generalized statements, which summarize the teachings of the Bible on the most salient aspects of this subject. Each of the seven propositions to be submitted rests on a careful induction of the verbal facts contained in the Bible, and in the Bible alone, with an endeavor to avoid error by a strict observance of the proper rules of procedure in investigation. The method is scientific, and the result to be submitted, should be and seems to be, peculiarly satisfactory.

1. The first proposition is this: The Bible teaches that *there is but one living and true God.*

Deut. iv. 35, 39—"Unto thee (Moses) it was showed, that thou mightest know that Jehovah he is God; there is none else beside him."

Digitized by Google

"Know therefore this day, and lay it to thine heart, that Jehovah, he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath; there is none else." *

Deut. vi. 4—"Hear, O Israel; Jehovah, our God, is one Jehovah."

2 Sam. vii. 22—"Wherefore thou art great, O Jehovah, God; for there is none like thee, neither is there any God beside thee, according to all we have heard with our ears."

1 Chron. xvii. 20—"O Jehovah, there is none like thee, neither is there any God beside thee."

Jer. x. 10, 11—"But Jehovah is the true God; He is the living God and an everlasting King. The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, these shall perish from the earth, and from under the heavens."

Isa. xliv. 6, 8—"Thus saith Jehovah, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer, Jehovah of hosts: I am the first, and I am the last, and beside me there is no God."

N. T. 1 Cor. viii. 4—"There is no God but one."

Mark xii. 29—"Jesus answered: The first (commandment) is: Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one."

Matt. xvi. 16—"And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living and true God."

Jno. xvii. 3—"And this is life eternal, that they should know thee, the only true God, and him whom thou didst send even Jesus Christ."

Gal. iii. 20—"Now a mediator is not a mediator of one; but God is one."

1 Tim. ii. 5—"For there is one God, one mediator also between God and man, himself man, Christ Jesus."

---

*It should not be overlooked by readers of the Bible that Jehovah is not an appellative, but the proper name of the one living and true God, and is never used to designate any other being. "President of the United States" is an appellative, and means no one in particular, but any one who may hold that office, but "Andrew Jackson" is a proper name, and designates a particular being. The 1901 edition of the Revision of the Bible transfers this proper name in the Old Testament, instead of translating it by the appellative "Lord." This is as it should be. And in the New Testament, "Lord," as a rule, is the equivalent of Jehovah. The explanation is interesting, but cannot be given here. But I will say that it furnishes an unanswerable argument for the Deity of the Christ.

Digitized by Google

Shorter Catechism, Question 5: "Are there more Gods than one?"

Answer: "There is but one only, the living and true God."

These selected quotations must serve as sampling the content of the Bible. It will be seen that the answer to Question 5 of the Shorter Catechism is a conclusion, attained inductively. The writings which constitute the content of the Christian's Bible are perfectly and rigidly consistent in their monotheism. All the divine paths therein lead from and to this citadel.

Nature is older than the oldest utterances in this Bible. The relation of these two revelations is a question of profound interest, but cannot now be treated. The Bible republishes in verbal form the whole lesson of nature, and then super-adds a supernatural revelation of the unique and distinctive doctrines of Christianity. The two, properly understood, make one continuous and consistent whole.

The relation of the two, in a general way, was so aptly illustrated by a class-room incident, that I venture to give my readers the benefit of it. There was a Japanese student in my Seminary class in Apologetics; and this question was before the class. I had submitted the view, that in different ways the same God is revealed in nature and in the Bible, but that it was only by the help of the Bible that we are able to read the lesson in nature, so that those without the Bible do not from nature alone learn of the true God. An induction from a finite world cannot reach an infinite object as its conclusion. As the class seemed to wrestle with this relation as a proposition difficult to understand, I requested Mr. Tosie Takada—who died last year a missionary in his native land—to remain when the class was dismissed. I then asked him to write for me on the blackboard, the Lord's Prayer in the Japanese language; and to be sure to be present at the next lesson. When, on review, the point recurred, I called the attention of the class to the markings on the board, and, excepting Mr. Takada, called for an interpretation thereof. Of course, it was a dumb show. When this was realized, I called on Mr. Takada to take the pointer and assist us in understanding, or seeing, what was there, but hid from us. He did so, and we all appreciated the helpful illustration it gave us of the doctrine that it is when we look through the eyes of the Bible and not otherwise, that we can

Digitized by Google

read the lesson in nature—and see that, as far as it goes, it is the same lesson in nature that we have in the Bible respecting God.*

The inductions on Bible phenomena are much simpler than on natural phenomena. The reason is, that the Book plainly and with great simplicity, but sporadically, tells us what its lesson is, and commits the language to us, to be read and understood, and to be verified in every part by all the parts. Hence, even our natural theology proper is not a science of discovery, as in natural science, but of construction. Much less is it true of Christian or Biblical theology. The induction whereby a school boy may now verify the law of gravitation is vastly easier than was the induction of discovery by Newton and his co-laborers, formulated in the Principia. So now, the Doctrine of Monotheism having been didactically although sporadically or miscellaneously announced, our induction thereon is not for discovery, but for constructive consistency and confirmation. Is the given utterance a part of the text? Is it isolated and incongruous, or in harmony with the whole? The doctrine of creation does not admit of an induction of discovery, but only of construction and confirmation. The fact having been verbally announced in the Bible. Under the title "Atom" in the British Encyclopedia (IX Ed.), a master hand shows that nature confirms this doctrine didactically set forth in the Bible, by leading us up to the very footstool of the Creator.

2. The second proposition is that—*This one God bears in the Bible the three names of Father, Son and Holy Spirit.*

This fact is so conspicuous in familiar Scriptures that there is no occasion for dwelling upon it. The facts for the exposition and induction are full-handed. For example, Gal. iv. 6—"God hath sent forth the Spirit[3] of his Son[2] into your hearts, crying Abba, Father."[1] Here, in this short passage, are the comprehensive name God, and the three personal names occur. 1 Cor. viii. 6—"There is one God, the Father[1] of whom are all things—and one Lord Jesus Christ[2], by whom are all things and we by

* In an essay, largely elaborated, a study of the various religions of heathenism attests that except where the light of the Bible shines, there is and has been since centuries before the Christian era, no knowledge of the God—the tri-personal God—whom we worship. Man began with God, but the knowledge died out, and it is revived only by supernatural revelation. It is only by teaching this doctrine to the rising generations that it is kept alive in the human mind.

Digitized by Google

him." 2 Cor. xiii. 14—"The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ;[2] and the love of God[1], and the communion of the Holy Spirit[3] be with you all."

Said Joseph Cook in my hearing, in the Chicago Parliament of Religions: "I once saw chiseled on the marble above the tomb of the great (Mohammedan) Emperor Akbar, in the land of the Ganges, the hundred names of God. Let us beware how we lightly assert that those names are one. . . I care not what name you give to God, if you mean by him a spirit omnipresent, eternal, omnipotent, infinite in holiness and every other attribute of perfection." I must be permitted to say that, for my part, I do care; for we might have this entire list of names and be in the dark as to the vital and most important name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Said President Washburn, of Roberts College, Constantinople: "The ninety-nine names of God which the good Moslem constantly repeats, assign these (moral attributes) to him," (Parliament of Religions, 569, Washburn), but it must be added, that in the Creed of Islam there is no communion between Allah and his creatures; no incarnation, no divine brother and no heavenly Father. The name "Father" does not occur in the list of 99 names. "My soul," says the Psalmist, "longeth, yea, even fainteth for the living God, who pitieth us as a father his children." This cannot be said by the Mohammedan. Indeed, it may be truthfully said that the Allah of Islam is not the Jehovah-God whom Christians worship, for the constitution and character of the two are not only different, but in contrast and incompatible.*

3. The third proposition is that—*These three names are not used interchangeably nor indiscriminately, but distinctively.*

These names are used in the Bible with the discrimination and precision of proper names. The Spirit is never called the

---

* "There is no God but God," is the keynote of the Theology of Islam. But thereby the Mohammedan not merely denies all polytheism, but also the Trinity of persons in the Godhead. He holds that to affirm the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is to be guilty of the damnable sin of "shirk," i. e., polytheism. Almightiness, untempered by holiness or mercy, dominates the character and conduct of Allah, who bonifies us by his supra-lapsarian avowal as creator: "Verily I will fill hell altogether with genii and men." (Sura xi. 119). As the God of Islam is not the God of Christianity, hence the legitimacy of missions to the Mohammedans. (Kellog's Hand-Book of Comp. Reli. pp. 16-23).

Digitized by Google

Son; the Son is never called the Spirit; and neither the Son nor the Spirit is ever called the Father. This usage is an established usage, and stands on the very face of the Scriptures. It is a case of uniformity without a variation. There is no more confusion here than in a family as to father, mother and the children; each is a term of definite designation.

4. The fourth proposition is that—*These three names are severally objective to each other.* The audience and the speaker are objective to each other. This teaching presents a double and most interesting aspect in both language and action. (1) As to language, each of the three not only speaks of self, but also speaks to and of each of the others. And, (2) as to acts, their operations among themselves are so orderly and uniform as to mark an established mode of procedure relative to each other. For example: (1) "If a man love me (the Son[2]), he will keep my word; and my Father[1] will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him. . . and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's, who sent me. These things have I[2] spoken unto you while yet abiding with you. But the Comforter[3], even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father[1] will send in my name, He[3] shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I[2] said unto you." (John xiv. 23-26.) In this scripture the three—Father, Son and Spirit—are set forth in actual and active correlations, distinctly and distinctively. The Father sends the Son and the Spirit, but the Spirit never sends the Son, nor does either of them ever send the Father. (2) Again: "But when the Comforter[3] (Advocate-Paraclete) is come, whom I[2] will send unto you (Filioque) from the Father[1], even the Spirit[3] of truth, which (who) proceedeth (goeth forth) from the Father[1], He shall bear witness of *me*."[2] (John xv. 26; xvi. 7.) In this passage we have a double enumeration ([3], [2], [1] and [3], [1], [2]) of the three names. Each of the three names occurs twice in this brief passage. And here, again, we have the Father, Son and the Spirit in their objective and orderly relations to each other, plainly expressed both in language and in operation in this duplex or two-fold statement.

Surely it is too obvious to admit of question that in this complex sentence these three names are used with relative and distinctly objective discrimination.

This circumstance of settled usage is sometimes spoken of as

Digitized by Google

involving divinely economic and subordinate relations, but, whilst in a proper sense that it true, we are not now concerned about technicalities. It is the simple Bible fact of which we wish to speak without refinements. It is plainer without than with them. In this matter, it appears plain that order is heaven's first law. And this subject does not breathe as freely and naturally, in the attenuated atmosphere of metaphysics as in the normal air of every-day Christian experience.

5. The fifth proposition or inductive group of Bible teachings is this—*The personal pronouns are freely used by and of each of these three names.* This is done so frequently, explicitly, and unequivocally as to put it beyond reasonable questioning that of each of these names, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, is, in some proper and legitimate Bible sense, the name of a Person. Various Scriptures abundantly warrant this proposition: (1) I might repeat here the passages already quoted under the preceding head, but other Scriptures in abundance are at our service; in one chapter just quoted (John xiv.) personal pronouns occur over seventy times. (2) "Now *I* (the Son) go unto *Him* that sent *me.*" (John xv. 5.) Here we have the first person, "I," and "me" of the Son, and, the third, "Him," of the Father. (3) "*I* am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of *Him* that sent *me*"—similar as to the first and second persons, but somewhat emphasizing the personal qualities. (John vi. 38.) (4) On the Mount of Transfiguration, a cloud of bright effulgence enveloped the six persons present, viz.: Peter, James, and John, Elijah, Moses, and the Christ—"And behold, a voice out of the cloud said: 'This is *my* beloved Son in whom *I* am well pleased; hear ye *him.*'" (Matt. xvii. 5.) We have the same personal pronouns in these two cases, and those used of the Father in one are used of the Son in the other. (5) The baptism of Jesus makes a valuable and impressive contribution. The voice of the Father[1] audibly and directly addressed the Son[2], and the Holy Spirit[3], in dovelike form, sensibly and visibly descended upon him. The three Persons unite in this sensuous manifestation—this once and only this once, but that was enough, as it formally and conspicuously ushered the Incarnate Second Person upon the stage of His public earthly career with the consensus, and on either hand, the support of the other two persons, who never forsook Him till

Digitized by Google

in the article of death, the surcharged cloud of divine wrath vs. sin over-shadowed his soul, and hid for a time the light of the Father's face—"Why hast Thou forsaken me?" But it did not extinguish the presence and sustaining power of the Holy Spirit in that most tragical event in the records of time. O my Father, not my will, but thine, be done. I came not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me. (Ps. xxii. lxix. 16-21; John iii. 34; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. ix. 14.)

It is believed that, under this 4th head, the personality of the Holy Spirit should be specially emphasized, and the means of doing so are sufficiently abundant.

(1) "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to—margin, to deceive—the Holy Ghost?" (Acts v. 3, 9.) Lying is a peculiarly personal offence; it can only be done by a person to a person. Yet, Ananias lied to the Holy Ghost, which plainly implies His personality. It as plainly implies this personalty as that of Ananias. You cannot lie to a principle, nor to an influence, nor to an attribute. Lying is one of the most infamous of all sins—in its intensest degrees and consequences, it is worse than theft or murder, which it so readily compasseth. It was faith in a lie that ruined our race; and faith in the truth as it is in Jesus, the Christ, is the only remedy.

(2) 1 Cor. xii. 11, 12: "All these (Charismata) worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each severally even as He will." In this passage the *voluntary* personal action of conscious discrimination is predicated of the Spirit. The one will of the Deity is exercised in the personal acts of the Holy Spirit, as has just been seen in the cases of the "Son and Father"—three distinctive individual operations of the one fundamental Power or infinite attribute of freedom.

(3) Acts xiii. 2-4—The scene is laid in Antioch, in Syria, a city of more than half a million, where the disciples were first called Christians. "And as they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost *said,* Separate *me,* Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them. Then when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. So they being sent forth *by the Holy Ghost,*" etc. The personal pronoun is here articulately used in two cases and personal conduct—speaking and ordering a deliberate procedure—is

Digitized by Google

attributed to the bearer of it. This citation is very simple, unequivocal and conclusive proof of the Personality of the Holy Spirit.

(4) John xvi. 7-15: These nine verses constitute—relative to our theme—one of the most remarkable passages in the Word of God. The personal pronouns therein are used of Christ and of the Spirit between twenty and thirty times; they are used by Christ of the Spirit with the same freedom as of Himself, and with greater frequency. Comment is needless. The Saviour thus deliberately applied, in this utterance, the personal pronouns more frequently to the Holy Spirit than to Himself—at least ten times to Himself and thirteen times to the Holy Spirit. In plain Bible sense, the Holy Spirit is as truly and really a Person as the Christ Himself. This seems to be a fair inference.

(5) The only additional proof of the personality of the Spirit that will be given is the sin against the Holy Spirit. Whatever may be the view taken of this sin, there is a principle underlying it, and that is, that just as crime, in its essential nature, is an offence against the State only as a legal personality with moral traits, so sin is an offense against this personal member of the Godhead. Crime in the natural government, is the analogue of sin in the moral government of God. Hence, David touched the quick when, in his contrite confession, he said: "Against thee, thee only—a Personal God—have I sinned." In a word, this sin against the Holy Spirit, upon which the Saviour lays such emphasis, forcibly assumes that the Holy Spirit is a person and divine. That much is certainly true, whatever the specific offending act or state.

Without pursuing this matter farther, the evidence adduced seems adequate to make it appear beyond a reasonable doubt, that the teaching of the Bible is that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are three Persons. A person is a distinctly, subsisting, self-conscious moral agent. We never properly predicate personality of any agent destitute of the attributes of moral agency—conscious intelligence, conscience, freedom.

Here we may again cite the Catechism as summarizing inductive proofs. Shorter Catechism Question 6: "How many persons are there in the Godhead? *Answer*: There are three Persons in the Godhead; the Father, the Son, and the Holy

Digitized by Google

Ghost; and these three are one God." Each of these names of the one Living God, is, in some legitimate Bible sense, the name of a distinct person. I will repeat the definition, which is believed to be validly applicable to each of these divine personalties: *A person is a distinctly subsisting, self-conscious moral agent.* This, of course, implies that the self-consciousness of the Godhead has, what involves no great mystery, a threefold function. Every solar ray has the threefold function of light, heat and actinism.

6. The sixth generalized statement or proposition is this: *This language of the Bible* is not empty sound, mere verbosity, setting forth superficial impersonations of imaginary and fictitious distinctions; but, on the contrary: It is evident, even from the citations adduced, that this language *points out and reveals to us, that there is and must be a distinction back of this language—back of these words, in the very nature of God,* who uses this language of Himself, *which distinction lays the foundation for the tri-personal manifestation and the expression of it,* in word and act, as we have seen, in the familiar and undisguised phraseology and conduct of every day life. Nor is it arrayed in the technicality of the schools. It is not illusory, nor deceptive language. The distinction between differing subsistencies is as real as that in the constitution of our own minds underlying knowing, feeling and willing—intelligence, sensibility, will. We have no innate ideas, but we do have innate powers of mind and body. This popular constitutional, threefold distinction, imbedded in the very nature of the human mind, is not adventitious or acquired, but original—innate or connatural—and lies back of the will and quite beyond its control, and back of all language expressive of it. In like manner, this distinction of subsistence in the tri-personal nature of God is constitutional. He is not tri-personal because He chooses to be so, but is so from the necessity of His nature; and the distinction, therefore, lies back of His will and beyond His control. The main point before the Nicene Council was whether the Son existed by the will of the Father, as Arians had asserted, so that in their view, He was in fact a created being, however exalted. The Bible has simply disclosed to us a state of facts which has existed from all eternity. Our God is tri-personal not of choice, but from the constitution

Digitized by Google

of His being, and cannot be otherwise. Nature might illustrate, but was, and is, inadequate to reveal, this constitution of the Godhead. It has taxed the resources of Greek with one of the richest human vocabularies, to set forth the phenomena from which is an immediate inference, noumenally intuited, and cognized by faith.

And if our limited minds are competent, consistent with substantial oneness, to unquestionably embody such a radically threefold or more complex distinction of powers as that pointed out, so far as we know, there may be, with no greater mystery, as the eminent Platonic scholar, Archer Butler, has reverently conjectured, a score or more of these personally subsisting distinctions in the nature of the Infinite and Eternal God. This psychological illustration is merely suggestive, as was St. Patrick's shamrock, and not an analogy or a logical parallel that "goes on all fours." What we do know is, simply that three, and only three, persons have been revealed to us; and, considering the amount of wrestling that this modest installment has occasioned us, it would seem presumptuous and preposterous for us not to be satisfied with what we have. And, even that much we do know only by faith. To long for a revelation to us of any more persons, in this stage of our being, than the three, would transcend the demands of our condition and the teachings of the Bible. The reason for the three, as we may see, is made seemingly apparent in the conception, preparation and realization of the plan of salvation, but not for any more than three.

The lesson thus gathered from Scripture teaching is written on the very face of the Bible, so plainly that, in stead of its being strange, it could not be otherwise than, as it has occurred in fact, that the plain readers of the Bible, in all ages and countries, should have understood from it that there are, in the only living and true God of the Bible, these three Persons, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. The "us" in the first chapters of Genesis, seems like a pre-intimation of plurality.* Three distinctly subsisting and divinely active personalities. This is the Bible God and the God of Christians. It was not the speculations of Greek philosophy, but the demands of a scriptural Christian consciousness, that persistently called, in the early

* See Witsius on "The Covenant."

Digitized by Google

Church, for a credal statement of this doctrine of one God of three Persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

It is in the name of this triune God that we have all been baptized, and that the missionary work of the Church, in disciplining the nations, was originally instituted and is now conducted; and it is in relation to Him that these disciples or converts are organized into His service and enjoyment here and hereafter.,

If scriptural teaching shows that the Holy Spirit is a person, as has been so plainly seen and emphasized above, there is not and cannot be, the shadow of a doubt as to the personality of the Father and the Son. History shows this.

It is noted, that in years past, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit had seemingly slipped or faded out of the distinct consciousness of the Church; but is it not again awakening? This present Christian era, or administration, is, in the orderly procedure of the triune Godhead in accomplishing man's salvation, properly esteemed, by way of eminence, the administration of the Holy Spirit, which, in its conspicuous and obtrusive character, was ushered in by himself on the Day of Pentecost, as Christ promised. In removing the two and only obstacles in the way of fallen man's return to the divine favor, the Godhead, in the person of the Father, conceived the plan of salvation, and in the person of the Son, prepared for it to the extent of removing the external obstacle of the broken law, opening the door for and joining the Father in sending the Spirit; and, then, the Holy Spirit follows up this preparation and advantage of an open door and completes the work by removing the internal barrier, or the evil heart of unbelief. Of him all the guests are effectually called, with a keen relish for the viands of the royal feast, prepared by the Son of the King. Say what we may in our creeds and preaching, the bestowment of the blessing of salvation is suspended on the good pleasure of the Holy Spirit. Personal election and glorification are realized only as the fruit of his work. "Jesus answered, Verily, verily I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." In this sphere of gracious and divine personal activity, it may be truthfully said again: that *order is heaven's first law*. This gift of the new birth, the Spirit bestows as he will. For this new birth man is absolutely dependent on

Digitized by Google

the divine will as operative in the Holy Spirit, the third person. But the rational ground of that determination of the Spirit's action is the secret of election—individual election.

7. The seventh and only remaining proposition to complete our statement of the Bible teaching, which clusters around our theme, is this: *That the sacred Scriptures affirm four classes of divine marks or predicates of each one of these three persons*: 1. Divine names and titles; 2. Divine attributes; 3. Divine works; 4. Divine worship. The detailed verification of this proposition, however, will be omitted. It is plain sailing.

REMARKS:

1. Neither of these persons is God without or apart from the others. Hence the doctrine here presented is as wide apart as the poles from tritheism, or the belief in three co-equal gods. They are persons of one and the same God. When Dr. W. E. Channing, the distinguished Unitarian, brought this charge of tritheism against Trinitarians, it must be said that he created his own difficulty, and did not find it in the Bible, nor in orthodox creeds, such as the Westminster Confession of Faith. But Dr. Channing was so impressed by the miracles and supernatural element in the character of Jesus, that he supposed him to be an incarnate angel, who set for man a shining example of sacrifice and devotion to duty. Dr. Channing's Saviour, therefore, was neither God nor man.

The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are one God, and only one; this one true God of the Bible is the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit. He is not the infinite, nor the absolute, nor any other abstraction; Hegelian or Neoplatonic, nor Manselian zero, but a living Being—a concrete, personal Being—a Being absolute, in that He is absolved from all dependence on aught outside of or other than Himself; an infinite living Being, in that he is subject to no limitations other than those that are internal, and that arise out of his own nature. The speculators who deny personality to God because it implies consciousness, which is possible only under limitations, need to be taught that the God of the Bible is revealed as subject to abounding limitations, but they are all ab intra-internal conditionings. The persons condition or limit each other, and each attribute limits and conditions every other attribute. This is a mark of self-sufficient perfection.

Digitized by Google

Of course, the persons, as co-equal and co-eternal, constitutionally condition each other in actual operation and manifestation, as seen above; and they cannot be fairly regarded as merely figurative, or metaphorical and fictitious impersonations of attributes, such as love, wisdom and the like, or of manifestations or operations, whether of creation, providence or grace, but as designating subsisting and predetermining properties of the internal divine nature of the one living and true God.

It is almost obvious to remark that when the Scriptures speak of the Son of God as the "begotten," or "only begotten," (John iii. 16. Gr.) derivation and dependency, as in the human relation, are not implied. The importing of this derivation into the divine nature was the *proton pseudon* of Arianism. The language descriptive of the human relation is chosen as best serving to suggest to our finite minds the eternal and underived filiation of the Son of God to the Father. Filiation and procession are expressive of the transcendent and co-eternal relations of Father, Son and Spirit.

2. The objection that the word Trinity is not in the Bible, is adequately answered, in that the thing meant is in the Bible, and if the thing designated by the word is in the Bible, there can be no reasonable objection to the word itself, for the content of these propositions, laid down and explained above, which summarize the teachings of the Bible, constitutes the content of the word Trinity—a term expressive of the intelligible psychological concept.

In view of what is said above, a like answer may be made in regard to the use of the word person, to designate the revealed characters of the divine hyposotasis. Simple existence does not imply nor pre-suppose an efficient cause as does dependence or change or beginning. The self existent is self-sufficient.

3. The Apostles' Creed. The very essence of this creed is the doctrine of the Trinity. This is made sufficiently manifest by a mere skeleton quotation of it. Credo: (1) "I believe in God the Father; (2) And in Jesus Christ, his only Son; (3) I believe in the Holy Ghost." The legend, perpetuated by the Roman Catholic Church, that the Apostles, before they separated, "composed this creed,"* lacks verification. It was never acted on by any council; it was the gradual outgrowth of the first four or

Digitized by Google

five centuries. It is the most remarkable instance in existence of the spontaneous and constrained expression or formal crystallization of the Biblically enlightened Christian consciousness of the early Church. What was the faith of the early disciples, embodied therein, has been the faith of the disciples of Christ in all subsequent ages. From the time of the formation of the Westminster Shorter Catechism, near the middle of the seventeenth century, this now venerable symbol has been placed alongside the so-called Apostles' Creed. Indeed, it may be observed, that, perhaps, the simplest notion we can have of the structure of this Catechism is that it is little other than the so-called Apostles' Creed, (Questions 4-38), the Ten Commandments, (Questions 39-81), and the Reformation doctrines of grace with the Lord's prayer (Questions 82-107), transformed into questions and answers. What precedes the law does not so literally follow the creed as does some other Catechisms, but it does so substantially. My own experience is, that the best way to teach the Shorter Catechism is, for the pupil to first memorize and recite exactly the Creed, the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer; and then omit Questions 43-81, certainly at first. This surprisingly relieves the case of abstractions and without loss. All the children of the Church, therefore, who are taught this Shorter Catechism and the Creed, are drilled in the doctrines of the Trinity. And when we say that this is a fundamental doctrine of Christianity, the meaning is, of course, that if you take away this doctrine, the whole superstructure of Christianity falls—tumbles into utter chaos.

4. The Great Commission. This was the nucleus and productive germ of the Apostles' Creed.

Matthew xxviii. 19—"And Jesus came, and spake unto them, saying: All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Rev. v.—"And Jesus came to them, and spake unto them, saying: All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations,

* See "Perry's Catechism for Catechists," endorsed by Cardinal McCloskey, of New York, 1884, page 50.

Digitized by Google

baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

The second reading of this Scripture is from the Revised Version, from which all the quotations in this article are taken.

There are three variations which may be noted in passing:

1. The old has "all power," the new "all authority" is given unto me. The original allows either, and each implies the other, for power without authority would have been a nullity, and authority without power would have been merely nominal.

2. The old has "teach all nations," and the new "make disciples of all the nations." The new is the better, for it renders explicit what the other implies.

3. The old has "baptizing them *in* the name." and the new, "*into* the name." This is a doubtful improvement, for what is explicit in each is implied in the other, and though both are allowable, yet they give occasion for explanation, the new being somewhat the more liable, perhaps, to be pressed into the service of error. The administration of this organizing ordinance "in" the triune name of God means, of course, that it is administered by his authority, and seals by implication the subject of it in a new relation to Him; whereas "into" designates the fact and intimacy of the constituted relation thereby symbolized, and implies the authority exercised in administering baptism. When the maiden is married into the name of her chosen husband by the authority of Church or State, the intimacy of the relationship thereby established, does not obliterate her identity or individual personality, however important, legally and morally, may be the re-adjustment of responsibility springing from the new relation.

It may be sufficient to remark, that the old version and the new version of this passage, and in general, are substantially the same. This text, with its context, is familiarly known as *The Great Commission.* Having proclaimed His unlimited possession of all the power and authority in heaven and on earth, He issues not an exhortation, but a command, to His followers to disciple and baptize all the nations. This great commission not only gives the Church authority, but imposes on her the solemn obligation to execute this command. This missionary campaign, therefore, is for the conquest of the world, whatever, in the economy of God, that may mean. We are soldiers of the Church

Digitized by Google

militant, and aspire to be crowned victors in the Church triumphant.

The fact that the discussion of the doctrine of the Trinity culminates in this Commission, which created the Church of Christ a militant organization, suggests that every Christian church is a missionary body. This is eminently so recognized by our Church. Soon after its organization as a distinct denominational body, the Presbyterian Church in the United States courageously and conscientiously entered on the work of foreign missions. Fitly, its first concern was our "Indians and then China. Perhaps, it is not as articulately and emphatically urged as it deserves to be, that it is pre-eminently the doctrine of the Trinity which authorizes and vitalizes the work of Christian missions, home and foreign. The Great Commission was historically the nucleus, out of which the Apostles' Creed grew into the faith and life of the early Church, and it has been heartily cherished in all subsequent ages. Our Book says: "Christ as a King has given to His Church officers, oracles and ordinances. . . His system of doctrine, government, discipline and worship . . nothing to be added or taken away." (F. G. 10). His Church is an institution, and has a business-like governmental organization. It is not only the right, but the duty, of missionaries, therefore, to organize their converts into particular churches for the worship of the tri-personal God, in and into whose name they have been baptized as soldiers of the cross for godly living, and the proclamation and disciplinary enforcement of the laws of Christ, by the courts of this Church. The growth of our Church, as of all other Christian Churches, is by the addition of individual converts, at home or abroad, to existing individual churches, or the addition of particular churches, newly organized of new converts. Our ministers have no warrant to baptize infants or adults except in actual or contemplated, immediate connection with a particular organized church of our own "faith and order." Christianity is an organized institution, and not a scheme of free will, individualism or anarchy. And in thus organizing a particular church by our home pastors or foreign missionaries, as our Church constitution explicitly provides, the officiating minister is bound to make the following prescribed declaration as crowning the transaction: "I now pronounce and declare that you are constituted a church,

Digitized by Google

according to the Word of God and the faith and order of the Presbyterian Church in the United States: *In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.*" (Book of Church Order and Form of Gov., chap. ii. sec. v.)

At the outset, it was remarked that this doctrine of the Trinity is intensely practical, in both the individual and the church life. This prescribed formal organization of converts into churches, under their covenant vows, illustrates and emphasizes this remark.

The Apostle Paul, who, as a foreign missionary, was directly chosen and sent forth in his mission work from Antioch by the Holy Spirit, promptly organized his converts into churches (Acts xiv. 23, Gr.), and then, to the day of his death, through peril and hardship, he cared for them by personal instruction, in visitations and sojourns, by letters and by special messengers, by enjoining discipline, and by authoritatively establishing uniform order in all the churches as one. He did not establish different kinds of churches or church order. Ignoring church organization in foreign lands must discredit our home Church, and also the official work of the Holy Spirit, and withhold from the converts what we conceive and believe to be the best type of the Church's faith and order for growth and discipline which has come down to us, and which we have fondly believed should be extended and transmitted by us in the sacred name of the tri-personal God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

In all the ages, those by whom the Incarnate Son of God has been worshipped have never faltered over the like personality and deity of the Holy Spirit, or the doctrine of the Trinity. Those who worship Christ in his true character, as the atoning, incarnate Son of God, are Christians and Trinitarians, for the two expressions are then, in strictness, equivalent, and those who do not thus worship Him are not Christians nor Trinitarians. It is a test most simple and practical and far-reaching, for it applies alike to the intelligent child or to the adult. Take the child's prayer:

> "Now I lay me down to sleep,
> I pray the Lord my soul to keep;
> If I should die before I wake,
> I pray the Lord my soul to take."

Digitized by Google

Poets have not been able to improve, much less to supersede, this prayer. But, only think of it: This prayer is addressed to "the Lord," the Christ. Thousands at the same time, and widely separated, offer it. Omnipresence to hear, omniscience to understand, and omnipotence to answer them are all implied, and these are the attributes of deity, and entitle the Saviour to this worship. Otherwise it would be idolatry. But, if it is His due, what must be the consequent to those who withhold it?

These things being so, it need hardly be said that the doctrine of the Trinity is fundamental, and taking, as it does, this practical shape in the worship of the Lord Jesus Christ, no doctrine is more simple, intelligible and precious to the child or to the wayfarer. The worship of Christ led to the articulate formulation of the doctrine of the Trinity during the first seven centuries. (681.) It abides and will ever abide.

Brethren, our people hunger for this doctrine. What a mistake it is for preachers to avoid it, under the impression that it is mysterious and impractical. Certainly no doctrine of the Word of God is more simple and practical, both in the individual and church life. The question of worshipping the Christ carries the whole case, in converting the heathen, and in building up the organized churches in all parts of the earth.

"The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds through Jesus Christ our Lord: and may the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, abide with you, evermore. Amen."

Washington, D. C., January 10, 1907.

Digitized by Google

THE MORE BEYOND IN LITERATURE.

By Rev. Harris E. Kirk, D. D.

What is the highest possible contribution literature has to make to the life of a man? This is not an idle question. It is important for the man of culture. It is interesting to the student of the times.

Culture is a public trust. It imposes a certain duty on the educated man, which does not rest upon the masses. Society has a right to ask more of him, because he has more to give. One of the privileges of culture is a knowledge of literature. "Culture," says M. Arnold, "is the criticism of literature upon life."

What is the nature of this responsibility? Men of culture belong to two orders. They are either creators or interpreters. Literature is the creation of genius, not of education. If a man is not born a creator, no amount of education can make him so. The men of genius belong to the order of creators. They are the great first listeners: nearest God, the True, the Beautiful and the Good. For this reason their sphere of activity is remote from the majority of mankind Genius paints the great picture, writes the great book, sings the great song, but the masses are too distant from its sphere to understand. They know genius less through its creations than through its eccentricities.

The second order of culture is the order of interpreters. These do not create; they are not men of genius, but they have talent, advantage, opportunity. Their duty is to translate the thoughts of genius into forms of speech and action intelligible to the common mind. They take the beautiful thoughts which

> "May never bless the world,
> Except its teachers take them in their hands,
> And give each man his portion."

The educated man of the second order is the mediator between genius and the world. This is the specific nature of his responsibility. He cannot write the great book, but he can understand it. He must translate the abstract into the con-

Digitized by Google

crete, the unusual into the familiar, and thus bring the riches of genius into vital relation to common life.

> "If from my book
> I gather that which feeds me, and inspires
> A nobler, sweeter beauty in my life;
> And give my life to those who cannot win
> From the dim text such boon, then have I borne
> A blessing from the book, and been its best
> Interpreter."

The influence of literature upon life depends largely upon the idea a man of culture has of his responsibility. For this reason he cannot afford to be indifferent to books and reading.

The spirit of our time makes a consideration of this responsibility an imperative necessity. This spirit is hostile to the best interests of literature because of two tendencies in modern life which work at cross purposes.

In the domain of creative and constructive thought—in that region where men dream dreams, and see visions, where great thoughts are born—life is viewed from a spiritual standpoint. The speculative materialism of the middle decades of the past century is dead. Philosophy has worked round to an idealistic point of view. The tendency to emphasize the spiritual values of life is almost universal. The philosophy of science is more or less spiritual in tone, while in literature the pendulum of thought swings between the rival creeds of moral and esthetic idealism.

But in the world of action as distinguished from the world of thought another force is dominant, that of practical materialism. This is due mainly to the abuse of the commercial spirit. Commercialism as such is a force morally indifferent, and when guided by higher considerations, is a potent missionary influence. But when it refuses to be subject to spiritual conceptions, it makes for materialism, because it tests the value of all things by a material standard.

These tendencies divide the intellectual house against itself. When the age speculates it thinks in terms of spiritual values; when it acts it uses the terms of material values. So long as thinking is confined to abstract regions, the age is idealistic. When it shouts its creed from pulpit, house top, or university

Digitized by Google

platform it is on the side of the soul. But when it moves out into the world of action, it is committed to the creed of materialism: to which that saying of Emerson is applicable: "I cannot hear what you say; what you are speaks so much louder."

The influence of this spirit upon literature is pernicious and hurtful. This is evident generally in the tendency to bring the idea of utility to the front. Men are tempted to estimate the worth of culture not by what it can do for the soul, but by its power to advance one's material or social interests. In the name of utility men sell their birthright for a mess of pottage. When a man sells what he should freely give, his influence is vicious; and the more privilege he enjoys the more vicious is his influence.

The influence of utility on educational conceptions appears in the revolt from classical to practical or technical education. The evil is not in emphasizing the importance of technical training, but in doing so at the expense of a broader and deeper culture. Universities are burdened with over specialization in thought and method. The ideals of students are frequently shaped entirely by the bread-and-butter sciences. Youth loses the ideal of world service, in the zeal to acquire wealth, or achieve fame. College presidents are no longer sought for among the theologians and philosophers, but are selected from the ranks of scientific or economic specialists. This is doubtless a necessity in view of modern conditions, but is nevertheless a symptom of a change of ideals.

A more hurtful effect of this spirit is its influence upon those who have enjoyed exceptional advantages. There is a class, constantly augmented from the ranks of the well-to-do, that interests itself in literature for other than the highest ends. It cares more to seem cultured than to be cultured. It patronizes literature from motives often selfish and insincere. The pretence of learning is valuable socially, and often tempts a man to simulate an interest that is not genuine. This is the dilettant, the amateur spirit of our time, and it is a spirit of vicious and inexcusable trifling. With this class books are not hobbies, but fads. A hobby is a good thing, a permanent outlet for a pent-up spirit, an avocation affording true recreation. But a fad is the thing the mob is affecting at a given moment. Books are patronized solely because they happen to be the thing of interest to polite society. The same insincere spirit appears also in the

Digitized by Google

custom of giving pretentious names to clubs organized for tea-drinking and gossip.

Do you know the parable of the puddle duck? His neck is too short, and his heart too faint to venture into the deeps. He makes his living dabbling round the shores of the stream, and by stirring up the mud, befouls the water so no one can drink it. These insincere triflers are the puddle ducks of literature, who muddy the stream of thought, to the disgust of the serious student, and the discouragement of the neophyte.

This pernicious influence appears in the tendency among highly educated men to a certain pessimism with regard to social betterment. Increased knowledge of the evils of life is not accompanied by a corresponding increase of incentives for social service. Knowledge is not always power; and where men are in the habit of asking the utility of everything, religion included, they are apt to miss the incentives needed to protect them from the pessimism of self-knowledge. While I gladly recognize the splendid exceptions, there is a well-defined tendency among college men to view the drama of human need from afar; to hold themselves coldly and critically aloof from human affairs; or what is much worse, to study the evils about them as mere phenomena, for the accumulation of statistics, or the writing of learned disquisitions, instead of seeking to know in order to improve these conditions. Such culture paralyzes effort, substitutes the criticism of life for life itself, and makes for stoicism. In fact it is quite the thing to reach the high point of development, where one is no longer capable of enthusiasm. It is bad form to be excited about anything. The idea of repose which is taught young people is a good thing, so long as it means a proper restraint of youthful crudities, but when applied to the deeper issues of life it becomes a doctrine of stoical repression: of repression of every normal and natural instinct. Hence cultivated people discount the value of spontaneous emotion. In some churches to be emotional is to be damned. At bottom this is the old stoic attempt not to understand the evil, but to render one's self indifferent to it; to discipline the soul into an attitude of complete apathy towards both good and evil. Such culture curses life with a sick fatigue, a world weariness, in which there is nothing new under the sun.

And yet, in spite of this effort to suppress enthusiasm as bad

Digitized by Google

form, it leads to something quite the reverse; to a passionate search for something that can excite, and by its novelty restore the semblance of life to the world-weary soul. At bottom this is a desire for new impressions, for something that can thrill, for some new thing. If to be degenerate is to be childish, what is more a mark of degeneracy than a love of novelty, the passion for some new thing?

The age needs to reflect upon Butler's philosophy of impressions. He says: "Passive impressions, when repeated, grow weaker." In other words, every impression that does not produce a line of conduct in harmony with one's moral nature, tends to disappear, and so weakens character. I read a book and its teaching shocks my moral sense. The shock is an impression inviting me to action. But I fail to respond to it. I meet with this influence again, and the impression is made a second time, but the shock is weaker and the power to act diminished. Habitual contact with this impression tends to make one's moral nature gross and insensible. One receives the impression until one's power of resistance is lost. As the sense of evil is benumbed, the passion for grosser and more novel forms of evil is intensified. I read a book, and its teaching stimulates me to noble action, but I fail to act upon the impression. Familiarity with this impression tends to diminish its power over me in proportion as I fail to act upon it, until, what at first excited the soul with noble aspiration, has now become dull and unattractive. Why? Because passive impressions, that is impressions that produce no corresponding action, when repeated grow weaker.

This law should be kept in mind in all our reading life. Many ignorant of it, or indifferent to it, read solely for impressionable excitement. Some delight in the hideous realism of the yellow journal, or the French novel; others in the sickly sentimentalism of Laura Jean Libby; others range the higher fields of poetry, music, art, and even philosophy and religion, still in search of impressions. The soul is not refreshed, but stultified.

The deadly effect of this search for impressions is its effect on our moral sentiments. It tends to destroy the difference between good and evil. It develops a spirit of wide naturalism, which admits anything into its ken, provided it can furnish the required excitement or stimulus. Art for art's sake, and the holi-

Digitized by Google

ness of beauty are the catch phrases of this impressionistic temperament. Estheticism is mental sensuality and more deadly than its physical counterpart, for it develops a capacity for admiring the good and the true only in abstract and impracticable forms. "All goods," says Professor James, "are disguised by the vulgarity of their concommitants in this work-a-day world of ours, but woe to him who can recognize them only in their pure and abstract forms." Culture of this type admires the beauty of holiness when seen in the face of the Sistine Madonna, but cannot see it in the face of plain Mary Jane. It is thrilled with pity when it raves over the Last Judgment, but cannot be moved by the vision of sin, suffering, and judgment in flesh and blood around them. It seeks impressions, new emotions, thrills in everything, professes interest in whatever for a given moment has a social value, while the last thing it desires is some form of healthy and beneficent service of mankind.

The man of true culture must understand and cheerfully accept his responsibility, but if he is to be a true interpreter of literature, he must despise, abominate, and reject the hollow insincerity, the unspeakable hypocrisy that makes more of sound than sense, more of form than character, more of thinking than men.

The more beyond in literature lies in a region which requires of a man noble and enduring qualities. What are the stages into it? I think there are two—the love of truth, which is instruction, and the love of true men, which is inspiration.

The love of truth is a sign of real culture. It is not great knowledge, but true wisdom that marks the cultivated man. The wise man is a lover of truth. Wisdom is the love of truth. This wisdom is possible only when one is a wooer of truth. It must not only excite our reason, but penetrate and inform our whole nature, purifying the passions and directing our actions. The love of truth awakes the primal instinct of immortality, the impulse to know. "It is possible," says Emerson, "to draw without the largest circle of achievement, a larger circle of aspiration."

> "A man's reach should exceed his grasp,
> Or what's a heaven for?"

Digitized by Google

The wooing of truth brings with it a sense of the largeness and mystery of life. 'Tis then we feel that we are living on the frontier of a strange country; beautiful faces gaze wistfully out of the brooding silence; the warm breath of heaven fans our cheek, and we know our kinship with God. Voices sometimes break the silence, thrilling us with divine impulses. We break over the barrier of the commonplace and return laden with spoil. Wonder comes into play, the worth and dignity of life impress us, and beget divine discontents, noble enthusiasms, dauntless purposes to look up and lift up.

To stand firm in time a man must get a foothold somewhere beyond time. He gets this when he puts behind his noble passion for truth, a vital sense of responsibility for the use of truth. Knowledge is translated into duty. He not only knows truth, but knows that he knows. This is true wisdom. It tranquilizes the heart and strengthens the will. Duty becomes the passion "to connect truth with the next thing to do," and so a man secures his foothold beyond time; already walks in the streets of that city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God. Such a life proves the truth of Tennyson's noble verse:

"Not once or twice in our rough island story,
The path of duty was the way to glory;
He that walks it, only thirsting
For the right, and learns to deaden
Love of self, before his journey closes,
He shall find the stubborn thistle bursting
Into glossy purples which outredden
All voluptuous garden roses.

"Not once or twice in our fair island story,
The path of duty was the way to glory:
He that, ever following her commands,
On with toil of heart and knees and hands,
Thro' the long gorge to the fair light has won
His path upward, and prevailed,
Shall find the toppling crags of duty scaled,
Are close upon the shining table lands
To which our God himself is moon and sun."

The second stage into the more beyond is the love of true men, which is inspiration. A real book is a combination of truth

Digitized by Google

and style. The style is the man. Literature differs from ordinary writings, because it is the expression of personality. Truth with a great soul added—that is literature. "History," says Carlyle, "is the biography of great men." Emerson's remark about an institution applies also to literature: A book is "the lengthened shadow of one man." A book is great when it is the spontaneous expression of a great soul. When a man cannot keep quiet about himself, but is compelled by some inner necessity to communicate himself to the world, his influence must prove inspiring.

If a book is according to Gerald Lee's fine saying, "the shouting of a man's heart from the housetops," the writer asks a definite sympathy from the reader before he can open his heart without reserve. Is not this true of your library? The evening comes after work is done; you lower the shades, light the lamps, and great strong faces look out upon you from well-filled shelves. The great voices are not silent—not to you. The chance visitor does not hear. He does not see those faces, but only row upon row of books, with the hum of the printing press still in them. But you hear and see, for they have opened their hearts to you. We know nothing of the companionship of great souls, until we feel in the presence of our books, that we can think nothing ignoble, plan nothing mean, attempt nothing unworthy of a man.

A book is like the sectional map of childhood. We cannot put it together until we find the man behind it. This is the power of the Bible, a book written by noble men, inspired of God, from whose writings peers into your very soul the strong, loving face of Christ.

If these are the stages into the more beyond, what shall we find there? What is the highest service of literature to the human spirit? I think it lies in creative power. "Produce! produce!" says Carlyle, "were it but the pitifullest infinitesimal fraction of a product; produce it in God's name. 'Tis the utmost thou hast in thee; out with it, then!" I am not prepared to say that creative power should take the form of written production. It is a good thing to plan one book in a lifetime, and give one's best thought to it. But this creative energy should take the form of a nobler life, a more inspiring and liberal service of mankind.

Digitized by Google

Good literature should create humility. Companionship with great minds gives one a just sense of his own worth, which is the highest form of humility. To know that there is something in common between you and genius is to be both humble and self-respecting. These great souls shout to us as we pass through the doors into the temple of knowledge: "Be bold! Be bold! Be bold! Be not too bold!"

Literature is the master of prejudice. "It is the work of a philosopher," says Addison, "to be every day subduing his passions, and laying aside his prejudices." To master prejudice is the guarantee of intellectual freedom. Dr. Woodrow Wilson has said: "The mind is a constitutional monarch. The mind reigns, but does not govern. We are governed by a tumultuous house of commons, made up of the passions, and the ruling passion is prime minister and coerces the sovereign." We cannot be too careful who is prime minister in our intellectual house of commons. We are all familiar with Lord Bacon's idols: those illusion producing fancies that interfere with right judgment. There is the idol of the tribe—racial or family prejudice; the idol of the den or cave—the influence of personal bias; the idol of the forum—the influence of conventional opinion, the all-powerful "they say"; and the idol of the theatre—the influence of false philosophies; and most of our errors come from one or the other of these false gods. These are the lobbyists of the devil in our house of commons, and each, by fair means or foul, is trying to get into the good graces of the prime minister. It has been said, "Happy is the nation that has no history behind it." It might also be said, "Happy the church without traditions, happy the man who has no grandfather." Prejudice rising from our past, our family or church pride; prejudice often disguised as distinctive principles, hinders progress and interferes with the transmission of truth. Prejudice according to Bunyan has the power of sixty deaf men to keep out the truth. Prejudice,

> ". . . like a dome of many colored glass,
> Stains the white radiance of eternity."

Companionship with great souls gives liberty to the mind, balance to the judgment, and originality to the will. Such an influence purges the soul of its evil humors and keeps it ever towards the light.

Digitized by Google

Literature creates a mastery over life's emergencies. Life comes to us not in bulk, but in details, each one of which holds an eternal possibility. That possibility is opportunity. A mind that habitually nourishes itself on great principles is most capable of doing small duties. Such a mind knows where to find the uncommon element of a common experience, and is never taken off its guard. Beholding life's vast meaning in the small event, the soul is tranquilized by the magnitude of its task.

Companionship with great books creates a sustained fullness of life. The soul is athirst for such a life. I believe that life's fullness is in the conviction that the world needs you, and this conviction is deepened by the attempt to make one's self necessary to the world. To make yourself necessary to the world is your highest duty; to realize that the world needs you is life's divinest joy. We must have great ideals if we would live greatly. No self-centered life can be great. Fellowship with the world's immortals gives to life the steadfastness men call conservatism, the intellectual integrity which cannot sell itself for gain or popularity, the sanity of judgment that enables one to resist the seductions of plausible novelty. Such a man will make service, not success, his highest concept in life. If a man seek success he can always get it, provided he aim low enough. Success is the badge of mediocrity. The man who would serve the world must aim high enough to fail. If he would be used of God, he must be willing to be used up. He cannot save himself and save others.

"That low man seeks a little thing to do,
Sees it and does it;
This high man with a great thing to pursue,
Dies ere he knows it.

"That has the world here, should he need the next?
Let the world mind him;
This, throws himself on God, and unperplexed,
Seeking, shall find Him."

Upon such a life heaven breathes its benediction. Such a a man looking out upon a timeless horizon, already tastes of the tree that is in the midst of the garden, and inspired by the power of an endless life, gives himself to the world in noble and enduring forms of service.

Digitized by Google

EUREKA, AN ESSAY ON THE MATERIAL AND SPIRITUAL UNIVERSE, BY EDGAR ALLEN POE.

By Rev. C. R. Vaughan, D. D.

(Continued from last issue.)

7. Another strange postulate of Eureka which embarrasses its conclusion, is not merely the difficulties of the particle itself, but the incompetent method of its discovery. The discovery of the particle is attributed to "intuition." "The reason flies at once to imparticularity." That means that the reason at once perceives that the original character of matter was a "simplicity" in its extremest form. "Intuition," as commonly understood—the direct unmediated "seeing" of a thing would probably justify this statement. But Mr. Poe's definition of "intuition" would hardly vindicate its application to the discovery of the particle. He says, "We have attained a point where only intuition can aid us; but now let me recur to the idea which I have already suggested, as that alone which we can properly entertain of "intuition." It is but the conviction arising from those inductions and deductions, of which the processes are so shadowy as to escape our consciousness, elude our reason, or defy our capacity of expression. With this understanding, I now assert that an intuition altogether irresistible, although inexpressible, forces me to the conclusion that what God originally created—that that matter which, by dint of his volition, he first made from his Spirit, or from nihility, could have been nothing but matter in its utmost conceivable state of what?—of simplicity." Here again the discredited methods of hog and ram are employed to create the "intuition," which discovers the particle. Intuition, as well as the axiom, is a product of "inductions and deductions," which are, unfortunately, altogether hidden from consciousness. Hog and ram are vindicated again. Now this species of "intuition" is not competent to ascertain and certify the particle: it rests on methods already discredited and hidden from all investigation. Would it not be safer to return to the old common-sense construction of "intuition"? The human mind is a "seeing" instrument; it was made for the purpose of "seeing," and

Digitized by Google

endowed with this intuitive capacity. It is useless to attempt to pass back of this original fact in the constitution of the human intellect. When anything is discerned by this faculty, power, capability, or whatever you may call it, it certifies the knowledge gained. It is absurd to go back of the direct perception of an odor or a sound, and attempt to certify it by any induction or deduction. Intuition is yielded by the perception of the senses, and by the perception of the mind itself. This direct energy of intuitive perception is a native endowment of the human understanding, with its own function assigned to it, which cannot be substituted by any other instrument of discovery. It is by no means a dependency of an inductive or deductive process. On the contrary, intuition has to judge and certify every step in an induction, and every assertion in the propositions of a deductive syllogism before the conclusion can be drawn, as well as the conclusion when it is drawn. The relation between intuition and the inductive and deductive processes determines the precedent action of the former, in order to the possible action of the latter. It is absurd to make intuition the effect of a precedent induction or deduction. It is still more absurd to make intuition the datum of inductions or deductions, which are "so shadowy as to escape our consciousness, elude our reason, and defy our power of expression." It is clear that the basis for the formidable ultimate conclusion of Mr. Poe's speculation—the establishment of a Pantheistic constitution of the universe—is placed upon a foundation of clouds and mere emptiness. The theory breaks down at the outset. The particle is not discovered by any such impossible "intuition" as Mr. Poe predicates. The particle is discredited, not merely by a contradictory simplicity of structure—a monad with an atomic constitution—but by a method of verification which involves absolute absurdity. It is somewhat curious to find "intuition" based upon "inductions and deductions," however hidden from human discernment, after the elaborate repudiation of hog and ram in the earlier part of the speculation. Since the intuition, which discovers the particle, is based upon inductions and deductions, though hidden from human discovery, it would seem as if the repudiated methods of Bacon and Aristotle were profoundly concerned in the discovery of the particle after all. Since these two highways of human investigation are discarded as incompetent to the enter-

Digitized by Google

prise of solving the secret of the universe, and imagination set up in their place as an organ of discovery, it is not to be wondered at that the absolute necessities of the search should reinstate the discarded methods, as all-important at least, to the development of the "intuition," which alone could discover the particle. Imagination as an organ of discovery does not seem to be a success in this enterprise at least.

8. The development of the process of the diffusion and the return of the atoms is described in "Eureka" in the most impressive way, and vindicates the desire of the author, that his speculation should be regarded as a poem. The writer goes into an elaborate account of the enormous sizes and distances of the stellar creation, revealing the force of the diffusive influence in terms which soon begin to weary the human faculties in trying to keep up with the billions and trillions, and sextrillions of miles, over which the distributing force carries the atoms of the broken-up particle. The rotary motion which is set up by the restricting power of gravitation, and, aided in the accomplishment of its purposes by the variations in the shape, size, and unequal distances between the atoms, soon begins the formation of the formed stars; and the most amazing pictures of the sublime scenery of the starry sphere are sketched by the imaginative artist. All that part of Eureka is well worthy of the attention of every lover of the beautiful and the sublime. It constitutes a poem of great merit. But it is only as a poem that it is entitled to praise. Its defects both as a consistent and trustworthy piece of reasoning, and especially in the moral conceptions which are developed by it, no such judgment of "Eureka" is possible. The following quotation will give some idea of the impressive delineation; although its full effect depends too completely on the full aggregation of its parts to be justified by a mere selection from them.

"Recurring, then, to a previous suggestion, let us understand the systems—let us understand each star with its attendant planets—as but a Titanic atom existing in space with precisely the same inclination for unity which characterized, in the beginning, the actual atoms after their irradiation throughout the universal sphere. As these original atoms rushed towards each other in generally straight lines, so let us conceive as at least generally rectilinear, the paths of the system-atoms toward

Digitized by Google

their respective centres of aggregation; and in this direct drawing together of the clusters themselves while undergoing consolidation, we have at length attained the great Now—the awful Present—the existing condition of the universe!" Of the still more awful future a not irrational analogy may guide us in framing an hypothesis. The equilibrium between the centripetal and centrifugal forces of each system being necessarily destroyed upon attainment of a certain proximity to the nucleus of the cluster to which it belongs, there must occur at once a chaotic, or seemingly chaotic precipitation of the moons upon the planets, of the planets upon the suns, and of the suns upon the nuclei; and the general result of this precipitation must be the gathering of the myriad now existing stars of the firmament into an almost infinitely less number of almost infinitely superior spheres. In being immeasurably fewer, the worlds of that day will be immeasurably greater than our own. Then, indeed, amid unfathomable abysses, will be glaring unimaginable suns. But all this will be merely a climatic magnificence foreboding the great end. Of this end the new genesis described can be but a very partial postponement. While undergoing consolidation the clusters themselves, with a speed prodigiously accumulative, have been rushing toward their own general center, and now, with a thousand-fold electric velocity, commensurate only with their material grandeur and with the spiritual passion of their appetite for oneness, the majestic remnant of stars flash at length into a common embrace. The inevitable catastrophe is at hand. "Eureka," pages 141, 142.

What is that catastrophe? "In this view we are enabled to perceive matter as a means not as an end. Its purposes are thus seen to have been comprehended in its diffusion, and with the return into unity, these purposes cease. The absolutely consolidated globe of globes would be objectless. Therefore not for a moment could it continue to exist. Matter created for an end would unquestionably, on fulfilment of that end, be matter no longer." The reversion into Godhood is now plainly in sight. So it is plainly said in "Eureka" itself: "Let us endeavor to comprehend that the final globe of globes will instantaneously disappear, and that God will remain all in all." Mr. Poe's anticipation of the future eternity is that a process of a creation of matter, its diffusion and return into unity, will be renewed

Digitized by Google

over and over again for all eternity—"a novel universe swelling into existence, and then subsiding into nothingness, at every throb of the heart divine." "And now this heart divine, what is it? It is our own!" "Eureka," pages 143, 145, 146. This last declaration caps the theory with inexpressible horrors.

9. Now what are the evidences, direct and collateral, on which this amazing result is predicated? The direct proofs are probably as completely presented in the description of the great forces at work, as they probably can be. All the proof stops short of certainty—the utmost of its reach is a probable conclusion. Certainly this conclusion is not only warrantable, but necessary, if the radical notion of Pantheism is conceded—the development of deity into the universe. The return of the particle into pure Godhood is the legitimate issue of such a postulate. But to present this theory as *per se* proof of Pantheism is another matter. The return to unity may possibly be true. That the return to unity is a return to Godhood is not proved by the return to unity. That the direct proof offered needs corroboration is confessed in the appeal of the theorist to certain merely collateral considerations.

10. It may be remarked that Mr. Poe's conclusion touching the evolution of the material universe into the Deity is fatally interrupted by the fact that the material universe, no matter how widely it may be conceived to extend, does not overtake or fix a limit on the immensity of God. The conclusion under review implies that the extension of God—so to speak—is coordinated with, and limited by the material universe, inasmuch as the "material and spiritual God" announced in the treatise, cannot consistently be supposed to overpass the material part of his constitution. Compared with infinite space, the material universe, no matter how widely extended, is but a point. The two dimensions are incommensurable. It has already been shown the finite is no measure of the infinite. It is plain, that in spite of the really powerful imagination of Mr. Poe, he felt the pressure of this difficulty; for he endeavors to meet it by the suggestion that many, nay! myriads of universes similar to the one which he has endeavored to analyze with such striking ability, each with its own special deity, are found within the great containing sphere. But it is vain to escape the notion of limitation involved in the finite, by multiplying the number

Digitized by Google

of universes, and returning to the old idea of Polytheism. Matter carries limitation. Many gods imply limitation on each particular god. The notion of the "infinite" spurns the fetters of any limitation, conceivable or inconceivable! The habitat of the One Only God—the dwelling-place of his immensity—extends infinitely beyond the manifestations of the universe, which as material, advance their limitations with every extension of their being. It is a vain attempt to fill the infinite of space by the indefinite multiplication of finite systems. It is vain to accomplish—it is vain to conceive that the immeasurable can be measured—that the illimitable can be overtaken by the limited, or filled by a substance *per se* finite. "Let me declare," says the author of "Eureka," "only that as an individual I myself feel impelled to fancy, without caring to call it more, that there does exist a limitless succession of universes, more or less similar to that of which we have cognizance—at the very least until the return of our own particular universe into unity. If such clusters of clusters exist, however—and they do—it is abundantly clear that having no part in our origin, they have no part in our laws. They neither attract us, nor we them. Their material—their spirit is not ours—is not that which obtains in any part of our universe. They could not impress our senses or our souls. Among them and us—considering all for the moment collectively—there are no influences in common. Each exists apart and independently, in the bosom of its proper and particular god." From this statement, it would seem that the views of Mr. Poe waver between Pantheism and Polytheism. No relation, however, between the two is stated; and the reader who is less gifted with the new organ of discovery than Mr. Poe is left hopelessly perplexed to determine whether the Pantheism which is to spring out of the evolution of one of these innumerable universes, is to be confined, by its own period to the development of its own particular god, leaving the rest of the myriads still under the administration of their own local divinities; or whether an ultimate coalition of all these universes will be followed by the merger of all these divinities into one supreme deity. Certainly the difficulty of evolving Pantheism is seriously increased by this establishment of many universes and many gods. The only way in which it can even be formulated in thought is to conceive the myriad

Digitized by Google

of universes precipitated or slowly drawn into a one vast aggregate of all the systems, and the separate absorption of the deities into one. The conception of the agglomeration of the systems is thinkable at least; the merger of the myriads of separate living infinite beings into one is wholly beyond possibility or belief. The theory of "Eureka," which was pronounced to be "true" seems to be very much mixed, to say the least of it.

11. Another collateral consideration is brought forward to sustain the Pantheistic theory, which is very strange. "No thinking being," says the author of "Eureka," "lives who at some luminous point of his life of thought has not felt himself lost amid the surges of futile efforts at understanding or believing, that anything exists greater than his own soul. The utter impossibility of any one's soul feeling itself inferior to another—the intense overwhelming dissatisfaction and rebellion at the thought—those, with the omniprevalent aspirations at perfection, are but the spiritual, coincident with the material struggles toward the original unity—are to my mind, at least, a species of proof far surpassing what man terms demonstration, that no one soul is inferior to another—that nothing is or can be superior to any one soul; that each soul is in part its own god—its own Creator—in a word, that God—the natural and spiritual God—now exists solely in the diffused matter and spirit of the universe; and that the regathering of this diffused matter and spirit will but be the re-construction of the purely spiritual and individual God."—"Eureka," pages 147-148. That is to say, human vanity grown morbid well-nigh to the degree of lunacy is proposed as a real but significant proof of Pantheism? The distinguished writer affirms that this feeling is universal among men; that it is characteristic of youth and as such appears in every young human being. We do not believe this to be true. On the contrary, it is seen in the experience of but very, very few; and those generally the more ambitious and aspiring of the race. Mr. Poe probably drew his conclusion from the recollection of the struggles of his own early and unsettled impulses, of his own extraordinary genius. This impatience to admit of any superiority is apt to grow morbid, and to become positively extravagant, where not brought under the restraints of good sense. That there are natural gradations in the mental furniture of men reaching over a vast scale of degrees, is too obvious

Digitized by Google

to be disputed. A prudent youth, looking to the likelihoods—nay! the certainties that he will have to establish and prove his place in the vast ascending and descending scale of human endowments—will soon see the prudence, to say nothing of the moral propriety, of not thinking of himself more highly than he ought to think. But when he interprets those unchastened impulses to mean that they point to a conclusion that he is a god, it is time his friends were looking after him. It may be very comfortable to a morbid sense of superiority for the half-crazed victim of his own vanity to construe himself the equal of Shakespeare, but the illimitable scale of inferiors to that supreme intellect of the race ought to bridle the notion that he is as much superior to Shakespeare as a veritable divinity is superior to a mere man. In this argument to prove Pantheism, there is a good deal more force to prove the dreamer to be a fool than to prove him to be a god.

12. A similar extraordinary testimony in favor of the thesis of "Eureka" is found in the supposed memories which have, at least since the time of the old Greek speculators, been laboriously construed as proofs of a pre-existent state. Occasionally some abnormal condition of the mind has led an individual here and there to indulge the same fancy. A distinguished judge of the Irish bench has been known to commit himself, not to a positive belief in this extraordinary notion, but to a respectful mention of the mental suggestion of what are called "reminiscences," which are unwarrantably so denominated. These "reminiscences" are rationally accounted for, not as evidences of a pre-existent state of personal being, but as fragments of waking or sleeping dreams, or as singular suggestions of past reveries which have left broken parts of a forgotten train of musing, or as the incoherent remnants of processes of fancies in morbid, or diseased, or half-crazed, or hysterical, or overstrained minds. They are the flotsam and jetsam of intellects in some abnormal condition. The number of those in whose experience such phenomena appear are relatively to the vast preponderance of minds in which no such developments are ever seen—very few. Very, very few men have ever had any serious or abiding convictions of having pre-existed before they appeared in the present life. Plato's theory was merely that of a professional philosopher, contrived to make his philosophy

Digitized by Google

seem to be equal to any demand of the inquisitive student. Such visionary fancies are only existent in minds disturbed by abnormal conditions, or in the daring imaginations of poets, who delight in excursions into the regions of fancy; but can command no serious consideration, except, it may be, to the poetical beauty which may possibly have been mingled with them. Assuredly there is nothing definite in these so-called memories or reminiscences which entitle them to be employed in any attempt to unriddle the secret of the "sorrowful star," and its fellows of the stellar expanses. These whimsical so-called memories of a past which have left no traces, pass, even within the narrow limits which they occupy, in a broken procession, leaving mere fragments of shadowy forms in reach of consciousness. They are utterly useless in the investigation of the noble subject which has engaged the splendid genius of the author of "Eureka." They are unworthy to be placed among the data of the inquiring intellect as reliable evidence. Is no reliance to be placed on the laws of belief impressed upon the human understanding? Is none to be placed on the attributes of God, the being who is conceived by the human faculties under the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, in order to realize the very highest conception of all that is excellent? Pantheism in its morid implications is positively horrible! It is worse than Atheism—intellectually as foolish—morally, a thousandfold worse.

13. Yet another implied, and altogether mistaken consideration is cited as confirmatory of the Pantheistic theory. The identification of ourselves with God is used to explain and justify the existence of evil. "In this view," says the writer, "and in this view alone, we comprehend the riddles of Divine injustice, of inexorable fate. In this view alone the existence of evil becomes intelligible; but in this view it becomes more—it becomes endurable. Our souls no longer rebel at a sorrow which we ourselves have imposed upon ourselves, in furtherance of our own purposes, with a view—if even with a futile view—to the extension of our own joy." From this statement, the evil spoken of seems to be limited to physical or natural evil—to suffering and sorrow. Moral evil is ignored! This is one of the most remarkable deficiencies of this astonishing speculation. What right has any adventurer in this awful field of thought to

Digitized by Google

eliminate the most obtrusive and appalling fact in the phenomena of human life—of actual and universal human history? All men are breakers of moral law! All men who ever lived in this world have been transgressors of that law! Injustice, unkindness, selfishness, lawlessness in ten thousand forms—cruelty, violence, murder, uncleanness, disregard of rights, vice in countless forms, war, tyranny, oppression, utter ungodliness—have and do everywhere prevail! Rape, savage brutality, fraud, lies, lechery, stealing, slander and deceitfulness are spread immeasurably! Civil government with its stern repressions, the gallows and its penitentiaries, its chain-gangs and its police, is everywhere indispensable in order even to that imperfect security which it is alone capable of accomplishing! Moral evil! The hearts and minds of the human race, over all the planet, have been straining and breaking over the awful mystery ever since the evil began its career! It is absolutely appalling, even when men alone are considered as the actors in the scene! But, "the heart divine is our own," and the converse of the proposition is not to be evaded. Our own is the heart divine! The soul shudders at the thought! The human heart, judged by its issues, is a fountain of wickedness, and Pantheism assures us that "the heart divine is our own!" Nay, more! Pantheism makes all things God; it makes God an active agent in all the unimaginable wickedness of human history! Nay, as all that is, is God—as he is the only actor—as man is but the particular development of God, he, the sinless and Holy One, is charged with the whole inconceivable record of moral evil in the progress of the world from its beginning! God is often sent to the penitentiary! He is often hanged for his crimes! He is guilty of every brutality and of every crime ever committed in the long history of a planet, not more conspicuously the "sorrowful star" than it is the "criminal star!" Yet all its abominations are charged by Pantheism upon God! Was there ever a more desperate outcome of any so-called philosophy than that carried by the theories of Pantheism, and discharged upon the venerable name of the most Venerable Being in the universe! The horrible notion is not only a moral, but a logical and intrinsic "Impossibility"! The existence of physical evil is mistakenly construed as the voluntary imposition of the submerged and undeveloped Deity who is the constitutive substance or substratum

Digitized by Google

of the human soul. Moral evil is the breach of the eternal law of right! All sin is the violation of law. It is logically incompetent to any being who is not under law. It is therefore impossible to God, in the nature of things. The moral law is the transcript of the nature of God. The relation between the moral law and the nature of God is the relation between a type and its impression on the paper. The only regulating rule conceivable, as applied to the Supreme Lord, is framed by the qualities of his own nature. There is no higher authority to impose a law upon him. He is therefore not under law. He is therefore not only morally, but logically and intrinsically incapable of sin. His nature makes it impossible for him to do wrong. As a breach of law, sin is only possible to a creature who is under law. Moral law is necessarily the expression of moral excellence in its supreme and perfect degree. The moral evil which has disgraced and cursed the world, is the sole datum of the energies of a moral and responsible creature: it can originate in no other way. Physical evil in all its multiplied varieties is the determination of the penalties of that high moral law. Those penalties are intrinsic in the law; they are not mere conventional appointments by a sovereign authority. Obedience to moral law will *per se* determine good results; breach of moral law will necessarily determine evil results, both in moral deterioration and in suffering. It is therefore an incompetent explanation to assert that physical evil is the voluntary infliction of self-torture by the incorporate Deity of the universe, with a view to the increase of his—which is also our own joy." Nothing is more certain than that the particular embodiments of the Godhood, called "men," would promptly banish all traces of physical evil, if they could! ?" Eureka" contributes nothing to the solution of the pathetic problem of human suffering and sorrow. Nor does the poetic or sentimental side of Pantheism in any, even the least degree, relieve the horrors of its moral implications. It talks in many a sweet and beautiful phrase of the loveliness of nature as the expression of the beauty of the underlying Deity. It avows its sentimental worship of the boulder covered with the trumpet-flower and the fern, the sun-tinted landscapes and sea views, the blue vaulted sky radiant with sunlight, and sparkling at night with the splendor of the moon and the stellar fires, as the true and the

Digitized by Google

only true worship of the incorporate Deity. But all this sentiment fades into the pallor of something more terrible than death, when the moral aspects of the doctrine are brought into view. All the asserted profundity of the philosophical and poetic disquisitions which are paraded as the highest expressions of the spirit of religion and noble worship, are discounted as mere folly and self-delusion, offered to a being so utterly scandalous and disreputable on the moral side! No poetic or sentimental expressions can hide the horror of the God of the Pantheist!

14. Mr. Poe closes his remarkable speculation in the following words: "I have spoken of memories that haunt us during our youth. They sometimes pursue us even in our manhood; assume gradually less and less indefinite shapes: now and then speak to us with low voices, saying, 'There was an epoch in the night of time, when a still-existent Being existed—one of an absolutely infinite number of similar beings that people the absolutely infinite domains of the absolutely infinite space. It was not, and is not, in the power of this Being, any more than it is in your own, to extend by actual increase the joy of his existence; but just as it is in your power to expand or to concentrate your pleasures (the absolute amount of happiness remaining always the same), so did and does a similar capability appertain to this Divine Being, who thus passes his eternity in perpetual variation of concentrated self, and almost infinite self-diffusion. What you call the universe is but his present expansive existence. He now feels his life through an infinity of imperfect pleasures, the partial and pain—entangled pleasures of those inconceivably numerous things which you designate as his creatures, but which are really but infinite individualizations of himself. All these creatures—all—those which you term animate as well as those to whom you deny life, for no better reason than that you do not behold it in operation; all these creatures have in a greater or less degree, a capacity for pleasure and for pain; but the general sum of their sensations is precisely that amount of happiness which appertains by right to the Divine Being when concentrated within himself. These creatures are all, too, more or less conscious intelligences: conscious, first, of a proper identity; conscious, secondly, and by faint indeterminate glimpses, of an identity with the Divine Being of whom we

Digitized by Google

speak; of an identity with God. Of the two classes of consciousness, fancy that the former will grow weaker, the latter stronger during the long succession of ages which elapse before these myriads of individual intelligences become blended, when the bright stars become blended into one. Think that the sense of individual identity will be gradually merged in the general consciousness—that man, for example, ceasing imperceptibly to feel himself man, will at length attain that awfully triumphant epoch when he shall recognize his existence as that of Jehovah. In the mean time, bear in mind that all is life—life—life within life, the less within the greater, and all within the Spirit Divine.' "—"Eureka," pages 148-150.

Thus this strange struggle with the mysteries of this strange world comes to its close. It is a failure—not such a failure as it anticipates of itself in the outset. "What I here propound is true; therefore it cannot die." But a failure so pathetic amid its splendid displays of misguided genius, as to awaken infinite pity for the Great, not less than for the Small of the lost race of the "Sorrowful Star." Pantheism wraps the mystery in a deeper gloom. It makes the repetition of the scenes of earth to be eternal! It involves God as well as his particular developments in the creature in a sad mixture of imperfect pleasures and pains. It dooms God and man alike to the dull monotony of incessant and unsatisfactory changes. It spreads the pathetic woe of the sorrowful star over all possible being without hope of relief! What a contrast with the prospects of glory, honour, and a blest immortality to which the finger of the Nazarene pointed!

Digitized by Google

THE HISTORY OF THE PRESBYTERIANS: A SKETCH.

By Professor T. C. Johnson.

(*Continued from last issue.*)

III.—Presbyterians in John Calvin's Day and Since.

Martin Luther came, in the first decades of the sixteenth century, swung his hammer of Thor on Romish abuses; stalked around amongst the mediæval ikons, crushing on this side and on that side, reducing them to pulp, or to fine dust—a heaven-sent agent to tear down and to pluck up by the roots; and to plant, too, truths of which the world stood in dire need. Let no Presbyterian detract from Luther's merits.

But no other understood the Word of God so well as Calvin in his age. No other man was so capable of bringing out the teaching of the Word, as to the faith God would have his church hold, the form of government he would have it exercise, the worship he would have it engage in, the life he would have it live. Moreover, the world may be safely challenged to produce a man who had greater *desire* to know the content of Scripture teaching, and to have the church follow it, and it alone. He made the distinction, indeed, between essentials and non-essentials in the qualities of any body claiming to be a Church of Christ. In spite of the difference from Luther on the Lord's Supper and other points, he was ever ready to reach forth his hand across the separating chasm, and grasp that of the great Saxon Reformer as the hand of a brother in Christ. He saw that certain things were necessary to the well-being of the church, which were not necessary to the bare being of the church. He saw this as few did. Nevertheless, he believed that it was the church's duty to conform itself to all known scriptural truth. And he believed that scriptural teaching is sufficient for the determination of every essential phase of the church's faith, worship, government, and life.

He brought out, with large success, into scientific form, the old Presbyterian faith of the Apostolic Age—the faith of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, the faith of Peter and Paul

Digitized by Google

and the rest. Into the Institutes he drew little from any philosophical system. They are built up of materials quarried from the Scriptures. They were intended to serve as an introduction to the study of the Scriptures, making it easier to understand aright the word of the Lord. The teaching of the Institutes is not in the same form as that of the Scriptures. They are the result of their author's life-long effort to set forth in scientific and systematic form that which the Scriptures teach in the form of living historical revelation and inspiration. His study of the Scriptures led him to walk in the paths trodden by Athanasius and Augustine concerning the doctrine of the trinity, in those trodden by Leo the Great and the Council of Chalcedon concerning the only Redeemer of God's elect. With these latter accordingly, he taught, as Bible doctrine, that the Lord Jesus Christ, being the eternal Son of God, became man, and so was, and continueth to be God and man, in two distinct natures and one person forever. Following Scripture teaching, again, he found himself walking in the paths of the great Bishop of Hippo, in regard to man's primitive state, in regard to the fall, in regard to the consequences of the fall, including the much-abused, much-misunderstood, but Scriptural and philosophically sound doctrine of total depravity, and the necessity of man's being saved by grace if he is to be saved at all; and in regard to predestination. He did not follow Augustine fully; only where Augustine had caught up and reflected the light from the sacred page, did Calvin wish to follow him. Calvin surpassed Augustine in his knowledge of the Word, and was less under the power of false views, preventive of his reception of the light from the Word. Hence he taught somewhat more perfectly on all these topics, particularly on election and the perseverance of the saints. Out of his sense of the majesty of God's soverign character, Calvin gave an emphasis to election somewhat beyond that which Augustine had given; and taught the perseverance of all the regenerate as Augustine could not, owing to his acceptance of the Catholic view of his day about baptismal regeneration.

On the great theme of the Atonement, Calvin, in his study of the Scripture, found himself traveling along the way that the saintly Anselm and Bonaventura, and, within limits, Thomas Aquinas, had gone. He, too, read in the Scriptures

Digitized by Google

that God's justice is as infinite as God's power; that God must pour out wrath against sin according to its measureless demerit; that man must suffer for his sin, and that the only possible ground of salvation must be found in the vicarious work of an infinite yet human substitute for man before the bar of Divine justice, who there has paid the full equivalent of the penalty due to man's sin.

On the doctrines of justification by faith as the sole instrumental ground of salvation on man's part, he trod in the way of Martin Luther, who, in that "doctrine of a standing or falling church," had apprehended almost perfectly the inspired teaching. In the matter of the inspiration of the Scriptures, too, Calvin found himself traveling the same road with Luther. These men are sometimes represented as having taught a "liberal view of inspiration." They are so represented by some who try to prove the Scriptures errant. But the representation has not been made good. These great reformers refer to the Scriptures with as much semblance of belief in their infallibility as our Lord and his apostles did. Along with Luther and the early Protestants Calvin had, of course, much to deny of the current teaching of the Roman Catholic Church—viz., transubstantiation and the five spurious sacraments, and purgatory, and saintly and angelic mediators, etc. With the disciples of Zwingli, at Zurich, he found the truth about the Lord's Supper to be in the so-called symbolic view; found it to be a great teaching and memorial ordinance; and upon the view he put his modification, making it more fully scriptural, in stressing the point that it is made efficacious by the concurring and efficient action of the Holy Ghost alone.

It is in his stress on this point and in the emphasis he gives to election and its corollaries, so ably handled by Augustine, and in his system of ecclesiastical government, and in the honor he puts upon the Word of God, that we find the distinctive features of Calvinism and of sound Presbyterianism as doctrine.

As Calvin's Presbyterianism, of doctrine, differed from that of the Bible chiefly, perhaps, in its being presented in systematic and scientific form. So in the same manner did his Presbyterian *form of church government.* His presentation of New Testament church government was not, however, as perfect as that of New Testament doctrine. His basal error as to the

Digitized by Google

proper relation of the church and state prevented his setting up a true counterpart of New Testament church government. Nevertheless, he went far toward this step.

He was not the first to *undertake* to re-establish Presbyterianism in polity after the Reformation began. As early as 1526, John Brentz, at Halle, in Suabia, and Franz Lambert, in the province of Hesse, had drawn up more or less imperfect schemes of Presbyterian Church polity. In 1530 Oecolampadius, of Basle, fearing spiritual tyranny, wished to join a body of elders with the clergy. At Strasburg a sort of Presbyterianism was actually established in 1531. Capito, at Frankfort, had made a similar attempt. These, where not mere theories, were limited, fragmentary and largely abortive. Calvin's it was to set forth the comprehensive system, and to give it the double authority of clear theoretic statement and practical realization.*

The constitutive principles of his scheme of government were:

1. The self-government of the church under the headship of Christ.

2. The ecclesiastical discipline of all the members from the least to the greatest.

3. A consistory, or parliamentary court, consisting of ruling elders and ministers of the Gospel, to exercise the discipline and government.

4. The recognition and reinstitution of the New Testament ruling eldership.

Calvin set the deacon forth also, in his New Testament aspects and proportions, as concerned with the care of the poor, and the funds contributed for pious purposes.

While distinguishing sharply between church and state, and holding that the church must be self-governing at the cost of self-support, should the state be unwilling to support the church without also governing it; he, nevertheless, held that, of right, the two powers should be in union, that in return for the church's tuition in morals and religion the state should support it. This was an impracticable and an illogical view. No state would support a church without interfering with its gov-

*Encyclopedia Britannica.

Digitized by Google

ernment; and when the state asked, Shall we support a body of teachers and have no say as to what they teach and how they teach? it had the logic on its side.

This connection of church and state, as always, issued in the most regretable consequences, the persecution of Servetus amongst others. Geneva had a religion—the State of Geneva had. It regarded its creed as a part of its constitutional laws, saw in Servetus one hostile to the very foundations of the state and one worthy of death, therefore.

It was a great merit in Calvin that he, while believing in the propriety of the union of church and state, yet distinguished clearly between the two institutions, and maintained that the church should be self-governing at all costs. It was no less a merit that he insisted on discipline—the discipline of all the members from the least to the greatest. He suffered banishment for this insistence once. When brought back to his seat of power, it was upon the expressed condition that his system of discipline should be enforced. He believed in the application of the power of God as well as the truth of God to the life of every member of the church. He secured the application of thorough-going discipline only after mighty struggles with libertines and spirituals. Discipline was applied in his day in Geneva not in as harsh a way as is popularly supposed. He stressed the point that it is to be administered in a spirit of gentleness. The ends of discipline were nobly stated, and it was never forgotten that one end of discipline was the good of the offender.

His scheme of discipline did much to assimilate the life of the church to the New Testament ideals.

He brought his people back to New Testament ground in holding that there should be two classes of presbyters in the church, holding that, in the New Testament churches, bodies of presbyters were elected to rule, some of whom were subsequently developed for and designated to the function of teaching also. He taught that these presbyters of two classes should rule after organization into a court.

The chief fault to be found with the ecclesiastical government of Calvin at this point was owing again to the connection of church and State. The state appointed the ruling elders, and while the people were allowed the right of assent, or dis-

Digitized by Google

sent, as to the ministers they should have, even these were first nominated by the Venerable Company of Ministers already in existence, and appointed by the civil power. Thus the people never exercised their prerogative of freely electing their officers, and the church was in practice subordinated to the state. Had Calvin been able to realize his ideal of church government, that government would still have been faulty, since he had been unable to shake off the then universal belief in the propriety of the union of church and state. But he did not realize his ideal. He simply went as far toward his ideal as was practicable in the local circumstances, as he confessed.

The Presbyterian doctrine and the Presbyterian government and discipline wrought together for the production of a correlated life. This type of life, as exhibited by Calvin and his co-religionists, was the outcome of the abiding sense of the exacting and enabling, humbling and uplifting sovereignty of God. Their God compelled them to this life by the absoluteness of this justice, and the infinitude of his love. A soverign of infinite majesty and justice, they felt they must obey him. A Saviour of boundless unspeakable love, they were irresistibly drawn to serve him. Conscious of obligations to obey the powers ordained of God, the Calvinists were good citizens. There were none better. But the representatives of state must not bid them do anything that seemed to be in conflict with plain laws of their *Great Sovereign's* own immediate imposing.

These spiritual children of John Calvin were not only good citizens; they turned the lewd city of Geneva into a city of at least relatively good homes, went to bringing their children up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; went to living, in a domestic way, soberly, righteously and godly in this present evil world; went to making all life pure, strong and even sweet.

Their doctrine, their government, and their type of life all alike led them back to a form of worship much like the simple type of the Apostolic and Primitive Church. Their ideal was a simple, spiritual mode of worship, adapted for intelligent devotion, which has been quickened by the presence and working of the Spirit of God; it made the sermon the central part of the worship, magnified instruction in the Word of God; it opened the foundation of free prayer; it gave to the congregation also the "inestimable blessing" of unitedly singing praise to the

Digitized by Google

Lord. The Lord's Supper and baptism were brought back to their Scriptural forms and significance.

The Presbyterianism of Calvin and Geneva was, like its prototype in the Apostolic Age, essentially a missionary phase of Christianity. This is seen not so much in the attempt of Calvin and Coligni to found a foreign mission in Brazil, at Rio de Janeiro, but in its reproduction of itself in many quarters of Europe.

It had taken up and made its own the German Swiss Protestants by 1549. It swept over the German Palatinate and made that country its own about 1563, finding congenial soil in several other German states. It spread into Bohemia, Poland, Spain, and Italy, in which countries it was soon to be wholly or largely eradicated by Romish persecutions. It spread into France, where, in spite of fierce and unrelenting opposition, a National Reformed Synod was held in 1559, representing about 2,000 congregations, with perhaps 400,000 adherents. At the conference of Poissy, in France, in 1561, the men of Calvin's view won the name of the Reformed party. Setting out with a creed penned by a disciple of Calvin, and perfecting a plan of ecclesiastical government similar to that in Geneva, this church ran a distinguished career down to 1685, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, notwithstanding the fact that it was involved in the political wars between the degenerate sons of Catherine de Medici, the Dukes of Guise, and the princes of Bourbon, and notwithstanding the more mournful fact that it became itself a sort of political party in the early course of its own history. About the epoch of the Revocation of the Nantes edict, near a half million of the best of the Huguenots went into exile, enriching the noblest currents in the life of every nation that gave them asylum. Though the small portion of the Huguenot body remaining behind had, for a long time, to live an underground sort of existence, and though they have increased only very slowly in numbers, they have not been without their heroic characters and their ornaments to the French name and nation. As a representative of the heroes Anthony Court may be named; as one of the men whom the French nation is proud we may point to M. Guizot.

Calvin's type of Christianity spread into the Netherlands. Here it met with better success than in France. Charles V.

Digitized by Google

and Philip II. tried to their utmost to destroy it. The Duke of Alva, ruthless servant of his ruthless imperious and bigotted master Philip, is said to have slain 100,000 Dutch Protestants between 1567 and 1573. But the old Frisian blood was not being turned to milk by Presbyterianism. On the contrary, it was receiving iron from it, and capacity for mighty wrath against all conceived wrong. Slow to boil, Alva made that blood boil. These Dutch Calvinists showed themselves a nation of heroes under the lead of the immortal William the Silent. The seven northern provinces, where the Gospel, as taught in Geneva, had brought forth much fruit, drove the Spaniards out and founded the union which grew into the Dutch Republic. Had the reformed religion been man-made, and had Calvin been the man to make it, he had had honor enough in the impress his teaching put upon the Dutch, who rose superior to the power of the greatest and most potent princes in the world at that time. In each of the seven provinces a reformed church was established, like the Genevan, in government, faith, and worship. These Dutchmen wrought out for themselves the Belgic Confession, which stands next to that of the Westminster, as an exposition of the doctrine of the sacred Scriptures. This confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Canons of Dort, have no doubt been amongst the chief instruments in God's hands in keeping so undegenerate down to this day the great people of little Holland.

The Geneva type of Christianity went also to the British Isles. The Scotch mind had already shown, in the case of the man, too, who was to head the Scotch Reform movement, some indigenous bent toward developing that type of Christianity. But once Knox came under the influence of Calvin, he readily appropriated from the great Genevese his more developed system. Scotland had been no good land prior to the Reformation. Hardly a corner of Europe had been so marked for uncleanness, robbery and murder. The Scotch had been semi-barbarous and bad. But in 1560, by the blessing of the Lord, on the preaching of certain faithful heralds, and on the testimony of his martyrs from Patrick Hamilton on, by the working of His Spirit, and by the unsanctified aid of land-grabbing barons, the reformed religion of Calvin's type was made the established religion of the nation. No other people has made

Digitized by Google

so full an appropriation, perhaps, of this reformed and pristine form of Christianity. Nowhere else has been seen such a transformation of the national character. Owing to the uplift in character thus occasioned, this once unclean people became a pattern of morality, this people, once so given to robbery and murder, became honest and considerate of the rights of others. This cruel people began to furnish leading philosophers, divines, and historians to Great Britain. Being a prolific people, in a small country, many of them had to find homes on other shores, They have carried with them their peculiar character, giving sanctified common-sense and moral backbone to almost all other lands.

Meanwhile, for centuries, owing to the connection between church and state, the Scotch Presbyterians had to endure much for the sake of their religion. For the first thirty years subsequent to the establishment of the Reformation, it was necessary to fight the papacy; for the next hundred years to fight prelacy; since that time they have had to fight lay patronage. Each of these periods is crowded with incidents of dramatic interest. From the second period we may cite the renewal of the covenant in 1638. The renewal was occasioned by the effort of Archbishop Laud to force on the Scotch the royal supremacy with a Romanizing liturgy. Revolution had set in with Jenny Geddes hurling her stool at an offending clergyman, whom she thought about to say mass.

It had been the custom of these Presbyterian Scotchmen, since the memorable December 3, 1557, when a number of Protestant nobles and gentlemen signed, at Edinburgh, a "covenant," to maintain, nourish, and defend to the death *the whole congregation of Christ, and every member thereof,* to so bind themselves together in the presence of a crisis. After their custom, as Laud goes about forcing them to use his popish prayer-book, they purpose to resist him.

The renewal of the covenant took place in Grayfriars Church, in Edinburgh, the 28th of February, 1638. It was a most extraordinary scene. Sixty thousand people from all parts of the kingdom had gathered to Edinburgh, and to that church. "The dense crowd which filled the church and adjoining graveyard listened with breathless attention to the prayers, the addresses and the reading of the covenant. The aged Earl of

Digitized by Google

Sutherland first signed his name with trembling hand upon the parchment roll. Name followed name in swift succession. Some wept aloud; some burst into a shout of exultation; some, after their names, added the words, *till death;* and some, opening a vein, subscribed with their own warm blood. As the space became filled, they wrote their names in a contracted form, limiting them at last to the initial letters, till not a spot remained on which another letter could be inscribed. . . Never, except among God's peculiar people, the Jews, did any national transaction equal in moral and religious sublimity that which was displayed by Scotland on the great day of her sacred National Covenant." Similar scenes were repeated throughout the country. The martyr spirit shown by these men and their children in the days of Charles II. and James II. lends immortal, pathetic, heroic splendor to the pages of Scottish history.

The exodus of the Free Church in 1843, because of the abuses of lay patronage, was one of the most glorious movements in all modern history. It showed that the martyr spirit still lived, and lent a glory to Scotch Presbyterian character. Tear the pages from Scottish history that tell of those who left manse and glebe and comfortable living and went out to want and penury, for righteousness' sake, in the middle of the practical nineteenth century, and you tear out that of which any nation might well be proud. Till *of late* the country has remained "an unconquerable fort of orthodox Protestantism,"—has been the most thoroughly Christian country in the world.

Christianity of Calvin's type went into England. During the reign of Edward VI. it seemed on the point of triumphing; suffered fearful persecution under Bloody Mary, and determined, though limited, repression under Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I. It came to the ascendant during the Long Parliament's struggle with the last of these monarchs; produced the Westminster Standards—the most consummate effort to translate into scientific and systematic form the Presbyterianism of the Bible, which has been made down to the present. It made a distinct advance on Calvin's grasp of the teaching of the Holy Scripture, in expounding and giving an elaborated place in the doctrinal system, to the covenant theology. Presbyterianism helped to create the political greatness of England.

On the restoration of the faithless Stuarts, in 1661, it suf-

Digitized by Google

fered gloriously for the truth's sake, its ministers vacating the best English benefices, rather than take the oath of conformity and abjure the solemn league and covenant.

Sad to say, those English Presbyterians subsequently degenerated, ran into Arianism and other heresies, dwindled in numbers and influence till, in the beginning of the last century, they were an insignificant body. Since 1800, however, they have made considerable progress.

This type of Christianity crossed the Atlantic and furnished many of the most forceful and determining characters in the North American colonies. The Presbyterian organizations did not, in all quarters, keep pace with the advance of the colonists, and multitudes have entered other churches; but the Reformed and Presbyterian churches of the United States and Canada carry on in these great countries the work of the fathers. They hold the same faith, polity, and worship, with more or less of clearness and carrying power. In one respect the American Presbyterian churches have vastly improved the theoretical church polity which they brought with them from Europe. They have eliminated Erastianism from the theory; and in terms repudiated all connection of Church and State.

Similarly, Presbyterianism has gone out from Europe, and particularly Great Britain, into Australia and into Africa. Through the great, aggressive, missionary movements of the last century and a quarter, it has gone out from its homes, on both sides of the Atlantic, to Japan, and China and India, South America, Africa and to almost every land in which Christian missions of any name have been established. The once almost universal phase of Christianity, the original and divinely enjoined phase, has re-appeared more and more since the days of John Calvin. Twenty odd millions of adherents indicate somewhat as to the prevalence of the phase at present.

But this number of adherents tells little of the influence of this branch of Christendom on the general welfare of the world and the advance of our Lord's kingdom. There is something vastly more important than mere numbers, in the personnel of an army of an earthly monarch,—the *quantum* of manhood in each individual soldier and his intelligent and faithful obedience to every word of his commander. The analogue is true of the army of the Lord Jesus Christ. Judged in this way, the

Digitized by Google

present Presbyterian army of Christianity may be more significant.

But the special value of this division of Christianity may be further vindicated by calling to mind certain incidental services to Christianity at large and to civilization which Presbyterians have rendered. Of these we name:

1. The stability they gave to the Reformation movement and have continued to give to Protestantism down to this day. 2. Their aid in the causes of civil and religious liberty. 3. Their services in behalf of general education. 4. Their services in behalf of decency and good morals.

The Calvinistic system gave stability to the Reformation inaugurated by Luther. Luther rooted up error; and he set forth truths fresh from the word of God. But it may be seriously doubted whether Protestantism would have been more than a temporary phase in Western Christendom without the work of Calvin. It was his merit to set forth the common truths of Protestantism, as well as that which was distinctive of his own system, in scientific form, using a phraseology the most of which could not be misunderstood. When truth has been so expressed, it cannot be lost; it bites its way into the fibre of human thought; it also becomes perfectly communicable. From the day of Calvin to the present Romanists have recognized that Calvin's co-religionists have commanded the citadel which obstructs their re-extension of their dominion over the non-Papal world of the West. Said the Romish Francis de Sales, a contemporary of Theodore Beza, who tried to convert Beza back to the Romish faith: "All the enterprises undertaken against the Holy See and the Catholic princes have their beginnings at Geneva. No city of Europe receives more apostates of all grades, secular and regular. Thence I conclude that the destruction of Geneva would naturally lead to the dissipation of heresy." This is a sort of parable of the truth. The Presbyterian body, it is believed, has been a steadying power to the rest of Protestant Christendom. It has not only been an aggressive force for good in a direct way, but it has influenced Episcopacy on the one side and Congregationalism on the other, so that they have been truer in their witness and more beneficent to the world than they could have been alone.

Digitized by Google

The most respectable writers of modern history, of most diverse schools, teach us that the Calvinistic influence on civil and religious liberty has been vast. They tell us that the civil and religious liberty of the Dutch, and of the British of to-day, is the heritage of Calvinistic teaching; and that Calvin was the founder of our own republic. Mr. Bancroft, the great American historian, said of John Calvin: "More truly benevolent to the human race than Solon, more self-denying than Lycurgus, the genius of Calvin infused enduring elements into the institutions of Geneva, and made it for the modern world the impregnable fortress of popular liberty, the fertile seed-plot of democracy." In another place he says: "A young French refugee, skilled alike in theology and civil law, in the duties of magistrates and the dialectics of religious controversy, entering the republic of Geneva, and conforming its ecclesiastical discipline to the principles of republican simplicity, established a party of which Englishmen became members and New England the asylum." Mr. Bancroft says again: "We are proud of the free States that fringe the Atlantic. The pilgrims of Plymouth were Calvinists. The best influence in South Carolina came from the Calvinists of France. William Penn was the disciple of the Huguenots; the ships from Holland that first brought colonists to Manhattan were filled with Calvinists. He that will not honor the memory and respect the influence of Calvin knows but little of the origin of American liberties."

Nor could the fruitage have been otherwise. The Presbyterian form of church government is the freest, manliest, noblest form on earth. It is the highest type of representative government. It cannot fail to suggest the right of suffrage in those citizens of civil government, who are possessed of the requisite character and intelligence. Nor can it fail to suggest the government of the State by officers who have been chosen by the free votes of the citizens. Both in church and State, therefore, it stimulates guarded and ordered liberty.

It was most natural, therefore, that colonial Presbyterians should have moved, with practical unanimity, toward the Revolutionary War. The sentiments expressed by the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians in Southwest Virginia, in January, 1775, the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence, in May, 1775, the Politico-Ecclesiastical Synodical action of the Synod of New

Digitized by Google

York and Philadelphia, of the same date, the work of Presbyterians in the Continental Congress, and in the armies, were fruits natural to the prevalence of Presbyterian polity of the Calvinistic type.

Certain theological and anthropological elements in this phase of Christianity, in a still more powerful way, stimulate the spirit of civil and religious liberty, particularly the doctrines of the sovereignty of God and the responsibility of man. According to this teaching, when God commands a certain thing and any other being bids *another* thing, a man must do what God commands. In the first Genevese Confession of Faith, prepared by Farel and Calvin, man's duties toward the State are defined. We are there taught that the citizen must obey all decrees and statutes, *except* those which contravene the commandments of God. Look out now, all ye tyrants, whether kinglings, hierarchs, plutocrats, democracies. There is leaven in the teaching of these men: that absolute sovereignty is found in the Lord God Almighty and Him alone. Order these men, or their true disciples, to do somewhat contrary to the word of God, and they will defy you. Ye Spanish tyrants, lording it over the patient Netherlands; ye Stuarts, strutting about the divine right of kings, and all your like, look sharp! Your sovereignty is at best only a very small thing as these men see things. These Presbyterians are God's men, and must acquit themselves as such.

The people of this form of Christianity have favored the education of the classes and of the masses. Thus did Calvin. Thus did Knox. Thus did the Puritans. We would not take from Luther his due mead of praise. Let it be said that "Luther brought the schoolmaster into the cottage, and laid the foundations of the system which is the chief honor and strength of modern Germany, a system by which the child of the humblest peasant receives the best education the country can afford." Let it be said that this example counted for much in other countries. Much may be claimed, nevertheless, in regard to Calvinistic influence in forwarding general education. In the persistent demand of Presbyterians for a well-educated ministry they gave an impulse to general education. Hear the leaders of the Scotch Reformation, of the first generation, say to those who would have admitted to the ministry men not well-edu-

Digitized by Google

cated, owing to the dearth of fit ministers: "We are not ignorant that the rarity of godly and learned men shall seem to some a just reason why that so straight and sharp examination should not be taken universally, for so it shall appear that the most part of the kirks shall have no minister at all. But let these men understand that the lack of able men shall not excuse us before God, if by our consent unable men be placed over the flock of Christ Jesus, as also that among the Gentiles godly, learned men were also rare, as they be now among us, when the Apostle gave the same rule to try and examine ministers which we now follow; and last let them understand that it is alike to have no minister at all and to have an idol in the place of a true minister; yea, and in some cases it is worse, for those that be utterly destitute of ministers will be diligent to search for them; but those that have a vain shadow do commonly without further care content themselves with the same, and so remain they continually deceived, thinking that they have a minister when in very deed they have none. For we cannot judge him a dispenser of God's mysteries that in no wise can break the bread of life to the fainting and hungry souls; neither judge we that the sacraments can be rightly ministered by him in whose mouth God has put no sermon of exhortation."

In this demand for an educated ministry they did much to secure an educating ministry, a ministry that would by direct and indirect influence conduce to the general education of their people. But the Presbyterians of the Reformation moved even more directly for general education of the people.

Says the historian Bancroft: "We boast our common schools; Calvin was the father of popular education, the inventor of the system of free schools."

It is a historical common place that Presbyterians and their half brothers, the Congregationalists, were the chief advocates and abettors of education in our country from its settlement till within the past few decades.

No people have done more for the decency and the good morals of the world than Presbyterians. Some of its opponents have indeed said that certain of its doctrines have a tendency to promote licentiousness; but generally its enemies charge it with undue austerity and strictness; say that it belittles unduly worldly pleasures, holding in unjustifiable contempt the various

Digitized by Google

forms of public amusements. We have but to look over the faces of Europe and America to see that those countries in which the religion of this phase has most flourished, have been most moral, and that they have been most moral precisely during these periods in which this type of religion has prevailed most fully.

The following testimony of the moral tendency of Calvinistic or Presbyterian doctrine is of a piece with a vast amount of testimony on the subject:

"He [the Calvinist] believes, indeed, in the eternal purposes of God, as to the salvation of the elect; but as to the hopes of his own salvation, and of his individual interest in those purposes he professes to obtain it by the evidences which he possesses of his being himself in a renewed and justified state. He knows from the word of God that the saints are 'chosen to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit' no less than 'the belief of the truth; that they are 'predestinated to be conformed to the image of Christ,' and 'created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.' And hence he feels that it is only so long as he experiences the sanctifying influences of the Spirit in his own heart, so long as he himself in some degree reflects the image of Christ, and walks, imperfectly indeed, but yet sincerely, in good works, that he can have any scriptural grounds for concluding that he is one of God's elect, and will have his portion with the saints. This is true Calvinism. And where is the tendency of this doctrine to make its followers slothful or confident, negligent of the means of grace, or inattentive to moral and religious duties? While the practical evils which Calvinism is charged with producing are so prominently and studiously exhibited to view by many of its apponents, let us not omit, on the other hand, to do justice to this calumniated system, nor forget the abundant good which it is not only capable of accomplishing, but which it actually does accomplish. . . . Among no denomination or description of professing Christians is there to be found a larger portion of humble, pious, and devoted servants of God, persons of a truly Christian spirit, zealous of good works, and exemplary in every duty and relation of life, than among those who hold the Calvinistic tenets." Thus wrote the Rev. Edward

Digitized by Google

Cooper in his *Letters Addressed to a Serious and Humble Inquirer, Etc.* Many such testimonies might be recited. A Methodist Conference, in addressing a council of the Pan Presbyterian Alliance, about a score of years ago, is reported to have said: "Your creed has furnished the inspiring spectacle not simply of a solitary and heroic soul here and there, but of generations of faithful souls, ready for the sake of Christ and his truth to go cheerfully to prison and to death. This rare honor you rightly esteem as the most precious part of your priceless heritage." It has been well said that "There is no other system of religion in the world which has such a glorious array of martyrs to the faith"; that "almost every man and woman who walked to the flames" in Scotland, England, Switzerland, Holland and France during the centuries of bitter persecution, "rather than deny the faith, or leave a stain on the conscience, was the devout follower, not only and first of all of the Son of God, but also of that minister of God who made Geneva the light of Europe, John Calvin."

Does a hearer feel like saying, Have you no word to say in dispraise of modern Presbyterianism? The answer is, Did time permit, somewhat could be said in dispraise of its slowness to cast off the improper connection of church and State, and of its inconsistent course in reference to this connection even in cases where the propriety of the union of the two institutions has, in terms, been repudiated. And grave interrogatories might well be put as to the significance of certain present movements in some branches of the Presbyterians, *e. g.*, the significance of loose tendencies here and there as to the inspiration of the sacred Scriptures; the significance of the apparent indifference, in certain branches of Presbyterians, to Presbyterian polity, and Calvinistic doctrine, seen in the movements toward Federation of Methodists, Congregationalists and Presbyterians in Australia, and in Canada, and in movements nearer home.

Certainly it has been a merit and a glory of the great Presbyterians in the ages past to stand for an inspired Bible, for Pauline, Augustinian, Calvinistic, Presbyterian doctrine, for a clear type of Presbyterian government, worship, and life. These things, one and all, were considered worth standing for.

Digitized by Google

To one reviewing, with veneration, the noble past of Presbyterianism, and noting that she has accomplished her beneficent services in behalf of God's cause and humanity, through the vertebrated character of her teaching, her government, and her life, the prayer comes:

"God of our fathers, known of old,
Lord of our far-flung witness line,
Beneath whose gracious hand we hold
The truth, to spread 'neath palm and pine;
Lord God of Grace, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget."

Digitized by Google

DECISION IN THE OLD AND NEW SCHOOL LITIGATION.

By Rev. Luther Link.

The decision in the litigation between the New and Old School churches in 1839 is probably responsible for the present unfortunate state of the law in this country relative to church property, forasmuch as it evidently inspired the decision in the Walnut-Street Church case, which to-day stands unreversed or unmodified as the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, and which, therefore, fixes the law in regard to the connection of the highest court of a church with the holding of property, even by the individual churches of a denomination. This is a subject which appears to be very little understood in our Church, judging by recent allusions to the experience of the Cumberland Church in such matters. It seems to be as little understood by the Northern Church itself, whose committee of the Assembly has been conducting litigation, which cannot be sustained by that decision, in utter unconsciousness, apparently, that they were not acting in accordance with it.

The decision, to which attention is now invited, was arrived at after several years' litigation, which was pressed by the New School against the Old School branch of the Church; after the action in 1837, abrogating the Plan of Union with Congregational churches; and afterwards the cutting off of four complete synods. The essential part of the former action is the following: "3. But as the 'Plan of Union', adopted for the new settlements in 1801, was originally an unconstitutional act on the part of the Assembly—these important standing rules never having been submitted to the Presbyteries . . resolved that the Act . . be and the same is hereby abrogated." Min. 1837. Digest, p. 701. The action in regard to cutting off the four Synods is the following, taken by the same Assembly: "Resolved, That by the operation of the abrogation of the Plan of Union of 1801, the Synod of Western Reserve is, and is hereby declared to be, no longer a part of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." 719 Digest.

"That in consequence of the abrogation by this Assembly of the Plan of Union of 1801, between it and the General Associa-

Digitized by Google

tian of Connecticut, as utterly unconstitutional and, therefore, null and void from the beginning, the Synods of Utica, Geneva and Genesee, which were formed and attached to this body, under and in execution of said Plan of Union, be, and are hereby declared to be out of the ecclesiastical connection of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and that they are not in form, or in fact, an integral portion of said Church."

The Assembly's justification to the Church for this radical action, is found in a pastoral letter in 1838, as follows: "(b) The last General Assembly acted under the conviction that the only possible way to secure peace, was by the separation of the parties in our Church, which could not agree on what were deemed important principles of doctrine and church order; and to effect this separation, which all parties acknowledged to be necessary, the majority thought proper to exercise the right of abrogating the unconstitutional action, which had brought the discordant parties into their present connection. This procedure was indeed novel; it had never been resorted to in our Church before, and from its very novelty, was calculated to startle minds not accustomed to that mode of action; it was, however, the only remedy for our case, and a remedy to which all governments, possessing a written constitution, are obliged to resort when embarrassed by unconstitutional laws." This admission should be carefully noticed. They freely acknowledge that the action was entirely new to the Church, and yet they glibly speak of it as a right of a majority, and justify it by pleading that all constitutional governments are obliged to resort to it when "embarrassed by unconstitutional laws." Their statement would seem to imply that it is a constitutional right, but will anybody, who understands anything about constitutional government, be prepared to admit it? The right was really the right of revolution, which acknowledges only the higher law of necessity in order to self-preservation.

Now note the worthlessness of the reasoning which follows, concerning the size of the majority: "(c) At the first meeting of the present Assembly, the friends of the last Assembly had the pleasure of ascertaining that the action of that body had been fully sustained by a large majority of our Church. So decisive was the preponderance of numbers on this occasion, that had even the members from the four disowned Synods been admitted

Digitized by Google

to their seats, there would still have been a clear and not inconsiderable majority in favor of the reform which the Assembly had commenced." Let us ask, by the way, What on earth has this to do with the question of constitutionality of the excinding act? They consider a majority omnipotent, for they add: "In these circumstances we thought the course of Christian duty was plain to all parties, and that if the minority could not consent to submit to our views of doctrine and church order, it was incumbent on them to make a quiet and orderly secession." Let this reasoning as to numbers be specially noticed, for it evidently inspires the decision which follows. It does not seem so wonderful that a body of ecclesiastics, taken promiscuously, should have applied such reasoning to their own action, but when a Supreme Court judge applied it to property questions, it does become astonishing.

They continue: "The essence of all religious liberty and ecclesiastical order is evidently involved in the principle that, when two parties in the same community cannot agree, the majority must govern; but, if the minority cannot, in conscience, submit either to the measures or the doctrines of the majority, it is their right and duty to separate and form a different denomination. For such a course as this, on the part of the minority, we were fully prepared; we looked forward to it with satisfaction as the only course conducive to the peace and Christion comfort of both parties; and had this course been adopted, we were willing to concur in any reasonable plan for the adjustment of any unsettled claims which might have appertained to the case." But the New School party wanted the matters, from the first, submitted to the Presbyteries.

Now let us follow the course of the reasoning of Chief Justice C. J. Gibson, of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in the final adjudication in this quarrel between the two contending parties over the property of the Assembly, rendered in May, 1839:

(a) "To extricate the case from the multifarious mass of irrelevant matter, in which it is enclosed, we must, in the first place, ascertain the specific character of the General Assembly, and the relation it bears to the corporation, which is the immediate object of our cognizance. This Assembly has been called a quasi corporation, of which it has not a feature. A quasi corporation has capacity to sue and be sued as an artificial

Digitized by Google

person, which the Assembly has not. It is also established by the law, which the Assembly is not. Neither is the Assembly a particular order or rank in the corporation, though the latter was created for its convenience; such, for instance, as the shareholders in a bank or joint-stock company, who are an integrant part of the body. It is a segregated association, which, though it is the productive organ of corporate successions, is not itself a member of the body; and in that respect it is anomalous. Having no corporate quality in itself, it is not a subject of our corrective jurisdiction, or of our scrutiny, further than to ascertain how far its organic structure may bear on the question of its personal identity or individuality. By the charter of the corporation, of which it is the handmaid and nurse, it has a limited capacity to create vacancies in it, and an unlimited power over the form and manner of choice in filling them. It would be sufficient for the civil tribunals, therefore, that the assembled commissioners had constituted an actual body, and that it had made its appointment in its own way, without regard to its fairness in respect to its members; with this limitation, however, that it had the assent of the constitutional majority, of which the official act of authentication would be at least prima facie evidence. It would be immaterial to the legality of the choice that the majority had expelled the minority, provided a majority of the whole body concurred in the choice." (Is not this precisely the principle of majority rule previously announced by the Assembly?) This may be predicated of an undivided Assembly, and it would be an unerring test in the case of a division, could a quorum not be constituted of less than a majority; but, unfortunately, a quorum of the General Assembly may be constituted of a very small minority, so that two or even more distinct parts may have all the external organs of legitimate existence. Hence, when, as in this instance, the members have formed themselves into separate bodies, numerically sufficient for corporate capacity and organic action, it becomes necessary to ascertain how far either of them was formed in obedience to the conventional law of the Association, which, for that purpose only, is to be treated as a rule of civil obligation."

This first paragraph contains the essence of the decision. It shows that the judge really ignores the question of division; and, in his view, the question is not one of equity between two

Digitized by Google

parties, but simply a question of the identity of the Presbyterian Church and its Board of Trustees. This position he arrives at by a curious disregard of the Church in its organic capacity. To him the Church is only the handmaid and nurse of the civil institution, the Board of Trustees, which alone is, he says, "the immediate object of our cognizance." This appears to put the cart before the horse. Is it not rather a perverted way to look at the matter to regard the creator as the handmaid of its own creature? And why should the Church be regarded as "anomalous" because it is not a part of a civil corporation? Is it necessary that a board of trustees should represent themselves? But if they hold property for those who appointed them, is the body that appointed them entirely free from responsibility for their acts? Can they be allowed to rob a portion of the constituency for whom they were appointed to act, with impunity? And if the Board of Trustees of the General Assembly hold property in the name of the Presbyterian Church, does not this raise the question, who constitute the Presbyterian Church. Whether it be the Church at large or a particular church, it is not a society of individuals, and must there not be some inquiry into the nature of its organization? There seems to be no escape from an affirmative answer. Even Chief Justice Gibson does not succeed in completely ignoring the organization of the Church, for he is compelled to inquire whether the Board of Trustees were elected by an "actual body," and by a "constitutional majority." Now he reasons that, because the General Assembly, (that is, the Church,) is not a corporate body "it is not a subject of his corrective jurisdiction." But does this fact relieve him of the duty of inquiring whether it is right for a board of trustees, elected by a united body, to hold in trust the whole property for one party of a divided body or church? Must not the court not merely take cognizance of the Church, considered as a voluntary association, bound by its own constitution as a contract, but in case of division, even inquire into the circumstances of the division, in order to ascertain whether the trust is properly protected? This appears to be a necessary consequence, for otherwise the majority of a church court is given the power first to cause a division, and afterwards to rob the minority of their property. This was, indeed, just what the Old School party did. Property rights of a church will necessarily depend upon ecclesiastical

Digitized by Google

rights. It is a perverse logic and a perverse use of language which confines the term "corporate" to institutions immediately created by the civil law, and argues that only such civil institutions are to have any recognition or protection from the law.

It is a miserable sophistry by which Judge Gibson dodges this obligation to protect the Church in its property rights. Fixing his attention upon a particular board of trustees, and for the time being ignoring any rival claimants, he argues: "It would be sufficient for the civil tribunals, therefore, that the assembled commissioners had constituted an actual body, and that it had made its appointment in its own way, without regard to its fairness in respect to its members; with this limitation, however, that it had the assent of the constitutional majority." Majority of what? It is evident that he means the majority of a court engaging in the election after division, for he proceeds to say: "It would be immaterial to the legality of the choice that the majority had expelled the minority, provided that it had the assent of the constitutional majority." If the minority had already been expelled, this must have been a majority of the Old School party. Thus it is clear that he gives the New School party no recognition whatever. By this reasoning, he says to them, in effect: I do not recognize your Board of Trustees or your party as having any rights whatever in the property of the Presbyterian Church. He does not argue the equity of the case at all; he simply ignores the claim of the New School party. In his second paragraph he makes this perfectly clear by declaring that their organization cannot be considered legitimate.

"The division, which, for purposes of designation, it is convenient to call the Old School party, was certainly organized in obedience to the established order; and to legitimate the separate organization of its rival, in contravention, as it certainly was, of everything like precedent, would require the presentation of a very urgent emergency." It is evident that he thinks expulsion from the Presbyterian Church was not sufficient emergency. But what does he mean by saying that it is impossible to legitimate the New School organization? Does he mean to deny them the right to organize a separate church? Of course, we cannot suppose such a thing. What he really means is, that they had no right as an organization to claim that they were the Presbyterian Church, United States America, the legitimate successor

Digitized by Google

of the Assembly of 1837. Granting that he is right, does this invalidate all claim of the New School party to a portion of the property? Hardly.

His narrative of events immediately follows the portion of the second paragraph as quoted, and it is as follows: "At the stated time and place for the opening of the session, the parties assembled without ostensible division, and when the organization of the whole had proceeded to a certain point, by the instrumentality of the moderator of the preceding session, who, for that purpose, was the constitutional organ, a provisional moderator was suddenly chosen by a minority of those who could be entitled to vote, including the excinded commissioners. The question on the motion to elect was put, not by the chair, but by the mover himself; after which the seceding party elected a permanent moderator, and immediately withdrew, leaving the other party to finish its process of organization by the choice of its moderator for the session." He speaks of the party who retired as "the seceding party;" but he fails to tell how the commissioners from the four synods tried in vain to get recognition; and being disowned, these could not, with accuracy, be termed seceders. Besides, granting that the organization of the New School Assembly was not a legitimate proceeding in the sense of being regular, does this exclude them from all claim of property rights? Of course, it showed that their claim to the whole property was not properly grounded, but why emphasize the absence of a fact, which, even if present, would not have constituted a solid basis for such a claim? The claim of the other party which did have regularity on its side, was just about as unfounded, and yet he takes it for granted that their claim is just, although they likewise claimed the whole of the property. The question should have been, not simply which was the board of trustees appointed by the Presbyterian General Assembly, but whether both boards did not represent equally just claims of property rights, by both parties of a once united church?

Will it be contended that by their unjust claim to the whole of the property they forfeited their rightful claim to a part? Hardly, unless one attempt at robbery can be pleaded as a justification for another robbery. This is precisely the plea of the gambler, but it is not considered sound, either in ethics or law. It is clear, then, that both the affirmative and the negative

Digitized by Google

arguments of Judge Gibson involve the same fallacy, namely, that one claim or the other must be a true claim. The decision is based upon a false presumption. The underlying logic is very simple, and it is this: The property of the Presbyterian Church must belong to the Presbyterian Church, therefore it is properly awarded to the Board of Trustees elected by the Presbyterian General Assembly. This bright piece of logic appears to underlie the law, as it is to-day, in this country, concerning church property. The discovery is very humiliating, but we think a comparison of the decision of Justice Miller, of the United States Supreme Court, will serve to show that it is simply a formal statement of Chief Justice Gibson's decision.

Dr. Dabney made a careful review of Justice Miller's decision, and concluded that it is wrong, and subversive of property rights and liberty. He calls it a new doctrine, but we believe that this is a mistake, and that it rather dates back thirty-four years to Judge Gibson. The reader will probably have no difficulty in identifying the above reasoning with the following principal clauses of the Walnut-Street decision:

"9. In the class of cases in which the property has been acquired in the same way, (*i. e.*, by purchase or gift) by a society, which constitutes a part of a general religious organization with established tribunals for ecclesiastical government, these tribunals must decide all questions of faith, discipline, rule, custom, or ecclesiastical government."

"10. In such cases where the right of property in the civil court is dependent on the question of doctrine, discipline, ecclesiastical law, rule or custom, or church government, and that has been decided by the highest tribunal within the organization to which it has been carried, the civil government will accept that decision as conclusive, and be governed by it in its application to the case before it."

Since church property rights must necessarily depend upon ecclesiastical rights, it is clear that this is the same as Judge Gibson's decision, that the Assembly is not subject to his corrective jurisdiction. This decision as to what will be done marks out just the course which Judge Gibson pursued. He took the church' decision, and ignored the rival claim. The decision that the church court will be allowed to decide all questions of faith, rule, or government puts the control of the property in the hand

Digitized by Google

of the highest court, whether it has any title to the property or not. Did not this rule rob the large majority of the Walnut-Street Church of their property? Exception is made where there is a clear difference in creed, and the property was given or acquired for the propagation of a specific faith, but this has no bearing upon the case in question. The decisions agree in the refusal to review the doings of the church court, even in its bearing upon property rights, and this puts it in the power of majorities to rob minorities.

The decision yields one of the most sacred functions of the State, the protection of property rights, in certain cases; and abandons one of the prime objects of constitutional law, the protection of minorities against the unjust aggressions of majorities.

Space will not permit the full quotation of the specious arguments by which a prejudiced decision is sustained; it is only possible to give an outline of the reasoning, as far as possible, in the very language of the "opinion."

The third paragraph recites the charge made by the New School party, that they had been unjustly treated by the moderator, who refused to recognize the commissioners of the four excinded Synods, and makes the point that the contention is good only upon the supposition that the Synods had been unconstitutionally dissolved.

He proceeds, then, in paragraph four, to meet this with the contention that the excinding act was constitutional. It was "nothing else," he says, "than an ordinance of dissolution." After quoting the resolution, (which we have already quoted), he says: "Now it will not be said, that if the dissolved Synods had no other basis than the Plan of Union, they did not necessarily fall along with it." Can this be admitted? We should think not. How could the abrogation of the Plan of Union dissolve the four Synods? Did it even carry the implication that they ought to be dissolved? How could they be dissolved except for cause? even if such a thing were constitutional; but where did the Assembly get its right to dissolve Synods and Presbyteries? Does the granting of membership in the Church imply the right to take it away at will? It would seem that Justice Gibson thinks so. He forgets that the Church is a divine institution, and that Church power is only ministerial

Digitized by Google

and declarative. He forgets, also, that the Assembly is a body of limited powers, it does not confer membership, and has no right to take it away.

But, perhaps, Judge Gibson is not so much to blame for his lack of knowledge of church government, for he gives the following as the contention of the Old School party: "On the other hand, it is contended that the Plan of Union was unconstitutional and void from the beginning, because it was not submitted to the Presbyteries for their sanction; and that no right of membership could spring from it." Is it not remarkable that the Church should have thought that, because the Plan of Union was originally formed in an irregular way, therefore all the rights of membership which had sprung up under it were invalidated? We should be inclined to think there must be some mistake here, and that it was a plea entered without the sanction of the Church, except for the fact that we find practically the same reasoning in answer to one of the New School arguments. Here is the way the Assembly itself put it: "Again, we are told in the protest, in reference to this new plan of government," that its omission of elders, being expressly provided for and designed, does not vitiate the organization—for then must numerous churches among us, in which there are no deacons, be for the same reason, pronounced unconstitutional." And we are free to confess that, if te constitution made the deacon a ruling officer in the church, he must be found in our ecclesiastical courts, and his absence would nullify their constitutional existence. This, however, is not the case. The argument is, therefore, lame, and shows its eastern birth." This evidently teaches that elders are necessary to the existence of the courts, and implies that the courts are essential to the existence of the Church. It certainly would not be considered good ecclesiology now to assert that the essence of the Church resides in its rulers.

But, still more to the point, as regards the effect of the abrogation of the Plan of Union, we have the following, in the Pastoral Letter of 1837: "From this act of abrogation, and from the declaration that it was void from the beginning, it would necessarily follow that the Churches, Presbyteries, and Synods formed under said Plan, were, of course, not to be considered as parts of the Presbyterian Church." And again, we find practically the same statement a little further down on the

Digitized by Google

same page: "It only remains to say, that, when this act is abrogated by the proper authority, as a matter of course, everything which arose under its influence and training is abrogated with it." Now, it is easy to see where Judge Gibson got his assurance for the statement: "It will not be said that if the dissolved Synods had no other basis than the Plan of Union, they did not necessarily fall along with it." The fallacy which underlies this statement is that the Assembly is a law-making body, like a Legislature of the State, and that membership results from its legislative act, neither of which is true. We have it in the Assembly's own reasoning in the same paragraph as the last quotation: "This, we presume, is the ground on which all the jurisprudence of our country stands, and upon which all our political courts and legislatures act." It is interesting and important to know that the Church itself furnished the false doctrine of the Church, and the exaggerated view of the powers of the General Assembly, upon which this false decision rests. This may palliate, but does not excuse the error, for the New School party strenuously contended that the act of abrogation was not constitutional; they rightly contended that the question ought to have been submitted to the Presbyteries. The Judge's reasoning sounds more like the reasoning of an advocate than of a judge; but we should not be too hard on him, for he may have been an honest partisan in his conception of church law, and the above quotations serve to show that, although wrong, he was probably honest in rendering his decision. They serve to show also that all the orthodoxy was not on the side of the Old School party, which may be a wholesome lesson to some of us.

Judge Gibson next argues the constitutionality of the excinding act by the fact, that the arrangement with the Congregational Churches was designed from the first to be a temporary expedient and, although admitting that it "acquired the force of law without the ratification" of the Presbyteries, he holds that "it was constitutionally enacted and constitutionally repealed by an ordinary act of legislation; and those Synods which had their root in it could not be expected to survive it." "It was obviously a missionary arrangement from the first; and they who built up Presbyteries and Synods on the basis of it, had no reason to expect that their structures would survive it,

Digitized by Google

or that Congregationalists might, by force of it, gain a foothold in the Presbyterian Church, despite of Presbyterial discipline." He is more of an advocate for the Old School party, than they are for themselves, for they had said that the Assembly had no right to form such a plan, and that it was, in its nature, unconstitutional, because it was a plan for the government of the Church by a committee. At any rate, the New School brethren did not agree that they had no rights which must be respected. They "contended that the repeal could not impair rights of membership which had grown up under" the Plan of Union. They certainly had a right to recognition as individual members, even though they may have lacked Presbyterian organization, provided they still desired to retain their membership in the Presbyterian Church, and were willing to become properly organized. They afterwards showed that they were Presbyterians by their organization, when they were compelled to set up for themselves. That a large number of them were sound in the faith, according to strict ideas, was shown by their subsequent Auburn declaration. All this goes to show that they were not ordinary schismatics, and could not have forfeited their property rights on this account.

They had not been fairly treated, in that they had been virtually condemned wholesale, and in general terms, without being given a fair hearing. They protested against this in dignified and temperate language, saying: "Christian candor the spirit of brotherly love, and the obligation to do unto others as we would have them do to us, we think, should have rendered the majority willing to afford their brethren full opportunity to exhibit their real views, to correct any misapprehensions, to disavow any false inferences attributed to them as their opinions, and to unite with them in the condemnation of pernicious error." We protest, also, because of the want of discrimination, as we think, in the statement of errors, some of which are propositions wholly of a metaphysical character, and on points by no means clearly and positively settled, either in our standards or in the sacred Scriptures; and calculated exceedingly to perplex and bewilder the great mass of ordinary readers in finding them classed with errors essentially at variance with both."

Now, Judge Gibson appears to recognize the force of such a protest, for in his fifth paragraph he acknowledges that they

Digitized by Google

had not been proceeded against judicially, for the reason that "it came to be perceived that the Synods had committed no offense." And yet he contends that the Assembly was competent to dissolve the Synods by a legislative act. After asking: "Could the Synods be dissolved by a legislative act?" he replies: "I know not how they could have been legitimately dissolved by any other." He says: "Had the excinded Synods been cut off by a judicial sentence without hearing or notice, the act would have been contrary to the principles of natural justice, and consequently void." Thus he holds that what the Assembly could not do without moral wrong in a judicial capacity, they could do in a legislative capacity with impunity. This is a remarkable piece of casuistry.

In the next three paragraphs he explains at length the nature of the Plan of Union, so as to show that it did really give right of membership, and right of representation. But he comes back to the same point in the last sentence of the eigth paragraph, saying: "That body, however, resorted to the only constitutional remedy in its power, it fell back, so to speak, on its legislative jurisdiction, in the exercise of which the Synods were competently represented and heard by their commissioners."

As if not quite satisfied with his original piece of casuistry, he comes back over the same old track in the ninth paragraph, thus: "Now, the apparent injustice of the measure arises from the contemplation of it as a judicial sentence pronounced against parties who were neither cited nor heard; which it evidently was not. Even as a legislative act, it may have been a hard one, though certainly constitutional and strictly just. It was impossible to eradicate the disorder by anything less than a dissolution of those bodies, with whose existence its roots were so intertwined as to be inseparable from it, leaving their elements to form new and less heterogeneous combinations." This sounds very much like special pleading. It should be noticed that, after declaring the act of excision "certainly constitutional, and strictly just," he goes on to support it by saying that it was "necessary to the eradication of the disorder." His argument to justice and constitutionality is as peculiar as his casuistry. Was it equally necessary that the Old School party should hold all the property, and therefore constitutional and just?

But in paragraph ten we reach the climax of the prejudiced

Digitized by Google

argument, by which Judge Gibson seeks to sustain his most remarkable "opinion." The New School party had endeavored to meet the argument concerning the Assembly's legislative jurisdiction, by asserting that it was not proved that the excinded Synods had actually been constituted on the Plan of Union. The Judge meets this by pointing to the fact that, when charged with constituting congregations without an elder, they had promptly pointed to the Plan of Union for its justification. But to quote the very language: It is said there is not sufficient evidence to establish the fact that the excinded Synods had actually been constituted on the Plan of Union, in order to have given the Assembly even legislative jurisdiction. The testimony of Rev. Mr. Squier, however, shows that, in some of the three which were within the State of New York, congregations were sometimes constituted without elders; and the Synod of the Western Reserve, when charged with delinquency on that head, instead of denying the fact, promptly pointed to the Plan of Union for its justification. But what matters it whether the fact was actually what the Assembly supposed it to be? If that body proceeded in good faith, the validity of its enactment cannot depend on the justness of its conclusion. We have, as already remarked, no authority to rejudge its judgments on their merits." This means that, whether the Assembly's doings are right or wrong, they must stand, because the Assembly did it, for the Civil Court has no power of review and control, even over civil matters. If this is so, why hear the case at all? and why does the Judge go to the trouble to argue the merits of the case in his decision? Why did he not confine his investigation to the simple question, Which board of trustees was elected by the Presbyterian General Assembly? That he did not do this, makes his "opinion" inconsistent, if not self-contradictory, for does he not do what he announces that he has no authority to do?

But here we have the Walnut-Street Church decision, with the superfluous and gratuitous reasoning left off. The first paragraph contains the whole of it, for he comes back to the point where he started. He is as indifferent as Gallio as to what the Church may do; and as Gallio was utterly indifferent to the beating of the ruler of the Synagogue by the mob before the judgment seat, so this judge is indifferent to the fact that the one Church robs another.

Digitized by Google

It is a sad commentary on American law that this decision, with its misconception of the relation of the State to the Church, should have outlived the century in which it was rendered. It puts it within the power of a majority of the highest church court to rob a dissenting minority, not merely of their ecclesiastical rights, but of any claim upon the property of the Church. It may be a majority of the individual church that finds itself in this situation, and the property may be that which their own money has purchased.

The trouble lies in considering the essence of the Church to be in its officers and courts instead of its membership; and to be deprived of representation is to be deprived of church life, and all ecclesiastical rights. Judge Gibson argues away the existence of the Presbyteries composing the four Synods on this ground. He begins his eleventh paragraph with this sentence: "If, then, the Synods in question were constitutionally dissolved, the Presbyteries of which they had been composed were, at least for purposes of representation, dissolved along with them; for no Presbytery can be in connection with the General Assembly, unless it be at the same time subordinate to a Synod also in connection with it, because an appeal from its judgment can reach the tribunal of the last resort only through that channel." Again we have some queer logic in this reason. Does the right of appeal also belong to the essence of the Church? He certainly makes it to consist in representation. Deprivation, then, means loss of church life and all rights, including property rights.

This is just the evil against which Lord Macaulay warned the English Parliament. He was advocating a change in representation, and it was met with the objection that the franchise constituted a property right. He replied: "You bind up two very different things; in the hope that they may stand together, take heed that they do not fall together. You tell the people that it is as unjust to disfranchise a great lord's nomination borough as to confiscate his estate; take heed that you do not succeed in convincing weak and ignorant minds that there is no more injustice in confiscating his estate than in disfranchising his borough." The New School party was so large that the Old School party was afraid to put off the matter of repeal, lest they should lose the control of the Assembly, which they had gained. The four Synods were cut off without reference of the matter

Digitized by Google

to the Presbyteries. They were deprived of their Presbyterian Church life, along with their representation, and Judge Gibson is so satisfied that this was constitutional and just, that he does not raise the question of a division of the property at all. The United States Supreme Court followed this decision, and so the law in this country affords no protection to the property rights of dissenting minorities. Would that some Lord Macaulay would arise to tell the courts of this country what wrong decisions they have made, by which minorities are abandoned to the tender mercies of majorities, even in the matter of church property.

We cannot close this review without calling attention to the fact, that the Assembly, by a formal resolution, praised and endorsed Judge Gibson's decision. They said: "3. We find in the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, renewed reason to confide in the protection of the laws, to trust to the fidelity, integrity, and wisdom of the public tribunals, and to rejoice in our free and noble institutions." They return thanks "to the respected gentlemen of the bar" for having ably, faithfully, and successfully served the Church in its temporal trials, the Board of Trustees for their "wise, firm, faithful, and successful administration of the trust committed to them." Then they add: "6. In view of the lucid exposition, of which recent events have been made the occasion, in relation to the constitution and principles of the Presbyterian Church, we recommend it to the churches under our care to obtain and circulate the history of the trial before the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, including an extended report of the speeches of the counsel." What a pity that the Church did not have at that time the candor to recognize that they had gotten more than their rights, and the wisdom to perceive that they had lost immeasureably more than they had gained, by fastening upon the Church a false doctrine of the nature of the Church, and the source of church power and a perverted estimate of the place and power of the General Assembly.

Digitized by Google

THE NATIVE HELPER AS A MISSIONARY FORCE.

PROF. HARLAN P. BEACH.

We employ the adjective native, despite the fact that its use is rightly offensive to highly-developed races like the Japanese, the Chinese, and the peoples of India. The reason why it has been so largely employed is that no equivalent, like imdigenous, is equally good when one is discussing a class of agents that must be differentiated from the missionaries. In this general discussion, the use of the national terms, Indian, Japanese, African, etc., only increases the difficulty. The term helper includes all those agents who are engaged in evangelistic work, or in other departments of missionary service, which are closely allied to the religious activities of the enterprise. While it might equally as well include all natives in the mission's employ, it is here restricted to the classes just named.

In the actual work of most mission fields, native helpers range in the character of their service, from the fully-ordained pastor, down through the various grades of subordinates, such as preachers, catechists, chapel keepers, colporteurs, Bible readers, and Bible women. It often happens that the educational department of a mission has in its employ men or women who would also come under the name of native helpers as above defined, since some of the teachers in lower schools give their time mainly to the impartation of religious truth; while a smaller number devote their energies to training helpers in stations, classes, theological schools, etc. This variation in office manifestly differentiates them into classes, which are of unequal importance in the work of world evangelization, yet what is said below is, in the main, applicable to all varieties of helpers.

Even an inconsiderable acquaintance with conditions on the mission field will show the importance of this branch of the service. The missionary goes to a land whose language is strange and difficult. No matter how faithful he may be in his efforts to perfectly master its niceties, he is never able to equal the best native users of the tongue. If he is to translate the Bible, he must find in them his authorities as to the best usage in mooted cases, or the nearest equivalents for ideas which have not hitherto

Digitized by Google

existed in the native mind. As a proclaimer of the truth, preparation must be made under the guidance of these same authorities. Literature of every sort is usually valuable, to the extent to which it conforms to the best style, and partakes of the local or national flavor, and here again, the foreign worker must have recourse to them.

But more difficult than the acquisition of the language of a strange people is the ability to appropriate the national life in its best elements. Customs continually confront one, which make or ruin the missionary's influence, according as he conforms to them, or ruthlessly disregards them as being "heathen and devilish." Some of them have a moral substratum, which may suggest such a phrase, but usually there is "a sweet reasonableness" about the custom, which commends it when it is rightly understood. The missionary is not called upon to be an unreasoning iconoclast, much less an indiscriminate despiser of everything that seems, to his ignorance, to savor of the superstitious or childish. It ought to be evident, that in lands where much that clearly needs a Christian protest, must be resolutely faced by the teacher of a new and holy life, it is important that no force be wasted in a Quixotic fighting of windmills, and in alienating the respect of the people in things non-essential. The stranger in a new country finds his first interpreter of the unfamiliar surroundings in his teacher, often not a Christian; but his best aid will be derived from those who have become Christians, and who, as helpers, are trying to harmonize the new teachings with what is true in the old order. To them, therefore, is committed the task of initiating the missionary into the life of the people. And here lurks a very real danger. The convert still carries with him the atmosphere of the old past, which is apt to mislead him in spite of his new principles. Moreover, he is in a despised and neglected minority, after having been a leader in the old regime. He is thus tempted not to make the breach any wider than is absolutely necessary, with the result that he may mislead the inexperienced missionary in the matters submitted to his decision. This stage is soon passed, even in virgin fields, but during that early period the native Christian is vastly more dependable and necessary than is the non-Christian native teacher.

When a fair mastery of the language and of native conditions

Digitized by Google

is attained, missionaries confront a new series of problems. By this time a little company of believers has been won, and an infant church begins to battle for life in the forbidding environment. The foreigner does not live in native homes, and so cannot know intimately the daily life of would-be Christians. Not a few desire to enter the church from false or interested motives. They are adepts at the fine art of hypocrisy, and if they are to be fully known, it can only be through others who are truly converted and who are perfectly familiar with the real life of such applicants. Though they are usually unwilling to bear testimony against such candidates, one or two may often be found who are more desirous to protect the good name of a holy church than they are anxious to avoid the enmity that adverse testimony may create against them. But the problems of the native church do not all lie at its threshold. How shall the little company of believers most successfully propagate the new faith and life? What shall be the church's attitude toward certain customs and laws? How are irregularities in the church to be corrected? What shall be the discipline of the infant church? In these and a thousand other less important items, the missionary must be the final judge; but it is clear that his decisions ought to commend themselves to the church members, as well as conform to the divinely established form. This is not likely to be the case, if his own views are not supplemented, and often corrected by the advice of illumination that native helpers can bring to his aid.

In process of time, the Church has grown and multiplied. The Christian community is exerting its influence in the entire region. Conflicts with the existing order of things often arise, and these must be settled with great wisdom. The new religion needs to be championed through the printed page, or in more or less formal assemblies of the people. Who is to perform this important function? At first it is often the missionary, but as intelligence increases, the most forceful advocate is the native Christian of education and irreproachable character. In many fields, this type of man has not yet been largely developed, but that is the sort of helpers who are ultimately necessary. It goes without saying that such men and women will, one day, be far more important to the Church in India, Africa, China, Japan, South America, than a host of missionaries from North America or Europe.

Digitized by Google

Not to mention many other respects in which the native helper is a factor of the utmost importance in the missionary force, one other function of such native leaders must be suggested. It is the part which they now play, and which, in the future, they will be called upon to perform in larger measure, as the teachers of theology and the writers of the native church. And here we stand upon debatable ground, viewed from the Occidental standpoint, as well as from that of a pure and aggressive native Christianity. It has been much debated lately, but, without entering into the nascent controversy, it may be said, without arousing dissent, that it is of the utmost consequence that native teachers and writers on Biblical and theological themes, as well as the leading pastors, should be most carefully instructed in these subjects. Indeed, we may go a step further, perhaps, and assert that, in the new interpretation of Christian truth that inevitably follows as races of differing temperaments and consequent needs receive the common bases of doctrine and life, it is of the gravest importance that any changes made should not only receive the closest and most prayerful scrutiny of the missionaries, but—what is equally necessary—that the leading pastors and teachers should be fully instructed in the Christian doctrine and thus make only such changes as the facts warrant, and as the best life of the emerging national church demands for its truest expression. It should be remembered that we inherit an Occidentalized Oriental religion, which, in the process of centuries, has come to contain some elements which would be more truly interpreted by the Christians of the Orient than they at present are by ourselves. In no other particular are the native leaders of mission churches, in the more cultured lands, so much needed as in this confessedly difficult and dangerous realm.

If the foregoing considerations have made clear the importance of native helpers in the missionary propaganda, an additional item will show how extensive the Church's responsibility is for this arm of the service. A glance at statistics shows that the native men and women helpers outnumber the foreign missionaries in most fields by the ratio of five to one. That is, each man and woman whom we send forth has in charge the training and employment of five native men and women. The fortunes of Christianity in non-Christian lands are thus mainly in the hands of this relatively large force. Nor does this state-

Digitized by Google

ment measure the importance of the situation, since it is a fairly well established point in missionary economics that the present ration is too small, and that, in order to the highest efficiency, the native force ought to be greatly increased.

This brief and imperfect review has aimed to show what the varied and important functions of the native helpers are. It ought to have made evident, incidentally, that they are an undoubted force, if qualified to perform their part in the great task, which, if they are not fitted for it, the Kingdom is the loser. But are they as efficient as they should be? If not, wherein does their weakness lie? The answer to such a question is only possible to one who might be himself sufficiently clear-visioned to know what was ideally desirable for widely differing fields, and keen enough to discern whether the native agents were acquitting themselves fully of the duties resting upon them. The present writer does not claim any such fitness to judge of the situation, but he ventures to make a statement which seems to be warranted by the reading of some fourteen years, and by personal participation in the work abroad, as well as by visitation of many of the fields. To him it seems evident that a good share of this native force lacks efficiency in one or more of the following particulars:

1. Its members have not been sufficiently prepared for the duties laid upon them. Missionaries have seen the necessity of a wide and speedy proclamation of the gospel. The message has usually first appealed to the poorer and less cultured elements in society, and as missionaries have felt that only Christians should be entrusted with this duty, the element of urgency has impelled them to commission men and women who are at once ignorant, relatively speaking, and almost wholly untrained for their work. In those lands where native learning is possessed by the helper, insufficient knowledge of Christianity and immaturity of spiritual experience have weakened his ministrations. Of the varied factors in unpreparedness, it more often happens that helpers lack training than they do genuineness of Christian experience and a knowledge of Christian fundamentals. If candidates for the ministry, and those who aid as their subordinates, require not only knowledge, but also training, for their work here in America, how much more important is it that native helpers should be trained for the vastly more complex and unfamiliar task of missions in foreign lands?

Digitized by Google

2. Native helpers, not a few who are not wanting in the particulars just named, and a multitude who are thus handicapped, are crippled and rendered partially non-effective through lack of adequate financial backing, either from the missionary society, or from the native church. All growth calls for enlarged resources, and a healthy increase in mission lands demands a corresponding increase in material equipment and in native co-operation. The mission boards often go on the supposition that a given appropriation for schools, local preaching places, supplies and service at the same, etc., is sufficient for all time to come. The apparent justification for this is sometimes a real one, sometimes only apparent, namely, that as those interested in Christian things increase, the added expenditure will be met by local believers and constituents. Probably, in the majority of cases, the decision not to increase the appropriation is a mistake. Missions are, generally speaking, only reaching the poor. The majority of these are living on the edge of poverty, with the possibility of losing all opportunity of securing a competence because of the limitations arising from the loss of positions because of Sabbath observance, the inability of the Christian to compete with unrighteous methods of business, etc. The struggle to keep soul and body together is so strenuous that it is next to suicidal to give largely either of their time or of their money to the furtherance of the Gospel. Where such conditions obtain, and where opportunities are opening up constantly for new work, or an enlargement of the old, helpers become discouraged and hopeless. It is not denied that this decisions of the boards has often impelled the native Church to exert itself and do what the foreign society refuses to do, but this is more often not the case. The result is, that the attempt of the few to do what is impossible for them to do well, leads to a scattering of forces and of energy, which ends in ineffectiveness.

3. A third factor in evangelical ineffectiveness is found in the peril of professionalism. Grave as is this danger in Christian countries, it is a far greater temptation in mission lands. Here, we build upon the basis of a general knowledge of Christianity, and so the pastor can do a broad and constructive work. In mission lands, excepting those under Papal domination, the masses know not one item of Christian truth. Nine-tenths of the

Digitized by Google

average helper's time may be spent in making plain to his fellows the few fundamental truths of our religion. Chapel, bazaar, and street preaching, as well as much of one's work with individuals, calls for an exposition of half a dozen facts of Christianity. To spend six or eight hours a day in this work makes the native helper an automaton. Set phrases glide from his tongue, new ideas find no market, and before long the once earnest helper becomes a professional, and begins to feel the truth of the charge often hurled in his teeth, that he does his work only that he may eat the foreigner's rice; he has become ineffective.

4. A lack of Christian statesmanship, also, tends to make native helpers ineffective. The weary, monotonous round fills life to the full, and no spirit or vision remains. If the missionary is broad-minded and has caught a glimpse of the greatness of his calling, he will see that this calamity does not overwhelm his native brethren. Too often, alas! he is likewise myoptical, and sees only to the week's end, or to the borders of his portion of the field. As nothing large is visible, nothing extraordinary seems called for, and missionary and helpers alike abandon themselves to the hopeless little task and wearily trudge on. There was, in this little group of six, the possibility of doing a larger and more inspiriting work, but their leader failed to sense it, and the opportunity passed by.

5. Akin to this, but usually differing in its basis, is a fifth source of inefficiency. It must be mentioned, even if it savors of what has become cant. It is the absence of the supernatural in the native helper; he lacks spiritual power, such as the Holy Spirit is willing and ready to give. If ever a man needs divine power, it is when, almost alone, he stands before overwhelming odds in a great spiritual conflict. The non-Christian world outside of China abounds in religion; Africa, India, and Japan are outwardly vastly more religious than we. Dwellers in mission lands are thus not in want of ordinary religion. What they do need, however, is a supernatural religion, and this, Christianity claims to be, and actually is. It is a mistake to suppose that the business of native helpers and missionaries is to bring to their people more religion. Their function is to bring new life, new power, new victories. This means that effective native helpers are those men and women who are constantly experi-

Digitized by Google

encing the miracle of daily renewed spiritual life. It is unspeakably more important that they have this enduement, than that they meet with all other requirements of their mission. And just here, one finds the commonest source of failure in effectiveness.

Without enlarging this list, let us see what can be done to offset, or correct, these defects, which so mightily militate against missionary effectiveness. Perhaps we cannot do better than to retrace our steps and again take up the points one by one.

1. To-day, there are comparatively few widely segregated missions, if Africa be excepted. Railways and other means of speedy locomotion make it possible to congregate the native helpers of a given district for training. It thus becomes possible for co-operative training of those select few in each mission, who are fitted for leadership in their own field. It would not be possible, nor would it be economical for any one mission to set apart persons to give the highest training to its own candidates alone. The union training school would so increase effectiveness that a number of missions could well afford to supply the staff for the institution. Graduates could return from it to train other helpers of less promise during the rainy season, or at some time, when work on the station is partially suspended. But such a union training school will fail of the desired results, if those in charge are not the persons who, by training, aptitude, and spiritual leadership, are pre-eminently fitted for this important work. Not only should the staff contain foreign instructors, but perhaps more important, it should have, as either permanent or temporary members, native workers, whose life is above reproach and whose zeal, tactfulness, and power are known in all the churches. It is evident that this training will not be wholly in the class-room. The laboratory and the oratory are equally important; for these native brethren and sisters need to be taught by doing, and quite as much as the disciples of John and Jesus do they need to be taught how to pray.

2. To the root of inefficiency, chargeable to the home societies, must be applied a different remedy. Knowledge and business principles are to be more liberally supplied and applied than is the case with many boards at the present time. Only those men or women who will agree to study the missionary situation which faces their society, should be elected to its

Digitized by Google

executive committee, and no secretary should regard his knowledge as complete until, with his own eyes, he has seen the fields for which his Church is responsible. In time this requirement would furnish the desired knowledge, but any society which relies on knowledge alone, will repeat the errors of the past. At least one-third of this inner circle, prudential committee, or whatever it may be called, should be made up of keen business men, who are in charge of large aggregations of capital or of labor. They must also be true Christians. If possessed of these qualifications, and of an intimate knowledge of the field, they will not permit the board to do what would be regarded as absolutely unprofitable, or else only moderately productive, in the name of business and manufacture. Probably, instances could be discovered in every mission board by such a committee, which if made known to the denomination, would create a demand for rectification. As such penny-wise, pound-foolish measures were exposed to common view, the business men of the churches would see the situation, and would respond. So far as the native helpers are inefficient because of some stupid, preconceived *a priori* theory of missions, which is not of universal application, the knowledge gained by a study of all the members of this committee would prove a corrective. In the case of larger boards, every field ought to receive a visit of a delegation at least once in five years, thus still further furnishing a corrective.

3. The best preventive of professionalism in native helpers is the absolute sincerity and freshness of the missionary who has them in charge. His problem is harder than theirs, for he lacks the wealth of illustration which they possess, and the great facts of Christianity are even more familiar to him than to them. If, therefore, he struggles daily to receive fresh impressions of truth and tries to make the old live in the present, they will be inspired to imitate his example. Callousness before perishing millions, to which he and they alike have become inured, must be striven against with strong crying and tears, if need be. No contagion is so likely to spread as deep emotion seen in a foreign leader. If occasional hours of prayer and conversation on the momentous task, which has become a commonplace, do not remove the callousness, let the strongest of the company be sent to those conferences which are now of annual occurrence, and be steeped in a spiritual atmosphere for ten days. When the favored few rejoin

Digitized by Google

their fellows, their faces will be like that of Moses when he came down from the mount. They, at least, will have seen a heavenly vision.

4. In the matter of statesmanship, the remedy lies largely with the missionaries, as already suggested. And here the missionary can only give what he possesss. How can a missionary become a statesman of the Kingdom of God? He can, during the years that now usually intervene between the time of his volunteering and of his sailing, lay a foundation for this statesmanship. He has to do with men of a certain grade of culture; he deals with this race rather than with another having other traits; he knows what the religions are with which he has later to deal; he can learn from the files of his society's periodicals what has been done by the missionaries of his church up to the present time; he seeks to ascertain what other societies having work in his chosen field have done, and in what respects they have been more successful than his own society; he reads the lives of Peter the Great, of Loyola, of Napoleon, to learn something of what others have dreamed of in the way of national or ecclesiastical development. These studies in ethnology, religions, missions, and biography, supplemented by what he has had of history, enable him to enter his field with expectancy. Then comes disillusionment. The poetry of life has completely disappeared; ambition, except to master his new language and meet the most pressing needs of his station, has flown. But, later comes his re-instatement in the ranks of the far-sighted. He reads the life of Verbeck and sees what that quiet "citizen of no country" did for Japan; David Livingstone and John Mackenzie suggest possibilities to him; Alexander Duff appears worthy of any man's following. A nearer view of his own land shows what is most needed. From one and another of the splendid band of men and women laboring there, he gets ideas which work in with his studies of earlier years, and at some moment of comparative leisure, he writes an article which sets other misionaries thinking. When an annual or a decennial conference is next held, he has his ideas formulated, and a plan of action is decided upon. A hundred missionaries go home with the broader view, and in the enthusiasm of the hour, the native helpers are called together, and to them is imparted the new ideas. A new order has begun for them as well as for his fellow missionaries. Much remains

Digitized by Google

for the missionary to do, and this can be done best through enlisting the wisdom and the co-operation of native leaders, it may be those of his own station, or it may be through the help of greater leaders than his vicinage furnishes. The Kingdom is coming.

5. That old motto of the missionary enterprise, "Spiritual men for a spiritual work," suggests the remedy for the last cause of inefficiency in native helpers. How can any Christian worker become possessor of supernatural power? "Let him who would be fragrant," ran the old Jewish proverb, "keep near the seller of perfumes." From the Powerful comes power. If the promise of Pentecost was for the year thirty, Anno Domini, there may be little hope; if Matthew xxviii. 20, and Acts ii. 39 are still in force, the skies are bright with promise. But men did not speak with tongues and work miracles among the Gentiles, Apostles though they were, on the spur of the moment. The retired room in Jerusalem, echoing no sound but that of soulful petitions, was the pulpit of Pentecost. No longer in Jerusalem, but in every remotest corner of this ruined earth, is the sanctuary where power is dispensed. India, Madagascar, Korea, North China, Japan in year of Grace, 1906, have proved that power is for the weak, and that the strength of the El Shaddai is as near the native helper and his foreign co-worker as is a breathed prayer, and that it is as effective to the throwing down of heathen strongholds as was the prayer with the subsequent forward thrust of Samson in the house of Dagon. As the missionary exhorts his native colleagues to seek for themselves this great dynamic—let him do so with Chaucer's quaint lines, descriptive of the parish priest, in mind and in life:

> "But Cristes lore and His Apostles Twelve
> He taughte, but first he folwede it himselve."

Digitized by Google

THE CALL TO THE GREAT SOUTHWEST.

By Rev. R. F. Kirkpatrick.

The crowning glory of the Church of to-day is its strong and growing sense of its privilege and responsibility to give the Gospel to a lost world; and every loyal Southern Presbyterian rejoices in the pre-eminence that our own Church has achieved in its gifts to that part of this great work, which for convenience we designate as Foreign Missions. The opportunities and needs of our Foreign Mission fields appeal to us powerfully, and our response is increasingly generous, both in our interest, our prayers, our gifts, and the personal consecration of our sons and daughters to the work.

But in the profound interest awakened in our hearts by the appeal of the Foreign Mission field we must not forget that there is also a great Home Mission field for which we are equally responsible, and whose call to us is equally eloquent, because it combines with the appeal of its own opportunities the needs of the foreign work. The distinction between Home and Foreign Missions is purely fictitious, made merely to facilitate the administration of the work; and the two together form the "world," which is the "field" in which the Church has been directed by her King to labor.

The entire South presents an attractive and needy field for Home Mission work because of the marvellous industrial development it is now undergoing, which, marvellous as it is, gives even brighter promise for the future; but because the needs and opportunities are especially large in the great Southwest, embracing Arkansas, Indian Territory, Oklahoma, and Texas, it has been designated as peculiarly the Home Mission field of the Southern Presbyterian Church; and these needs and opportunities, backed by bright promise for the future, would appeal powerfully to the heart of the Church, if it were but alive to them. It is incredible that the Church would make such scant response to the burning appeal of our Secretary of Assembly's Home Missions if it realized the splendid possibilities of this work, or that this great cause should have to struggle desperately for recognition along with the pressing demands of Local Home Missions, or the irresistible appeals of Foreign Missions.

Digitized by Google

By reason of its vast mineral wealth, diversity of climate and soil, forests and broad acres of fertile farming lands, which are as yet but little developed, this section whose greatness the American people have yet to realize is attracting thousands of people to its borders annually, and its rapid growth, backed by its varied resources, suggests possibilities for the future that defy the wildest reaches of the imagination to compass.

Of Texas, which comprises the largest part of this great Southwestern country, Dr. Morris has said that the orator is yet to be born who can make the American people realize its greatness, its mere size. Within its area of 265,000 square miles there are 170,000,000 acres of land, less than one-tenth of which is under cultivation; yet its agricultural products during 1905 were valued at $300,000,000.00. In its production of cotton it is already far in the lead of all other States, while its yield of wheat and rice are scarcely second to any. It is well known as one of the leading cotton raising States, and at the same time it probably stands pre-eminent above all others in its stores of granite, iron, and petroleum. So diversified is its climate that in the northern portion of the State quantities of fine apples are grown, while oranges and other semi-tropical fruits are grown with equal success in the southern part. Easttern and Southwest Texas are becoming immense orchards and truck gardens, from which fruits and vegetables are shipped to Northern markets on a scale that is almost incredible.

In the spring of 1904 Governor Herrick, of Ohio, after travelling through Southwest Texas, telegraphed to Governor Lanham, of Texas, "I have just seen the richest section of the greatest State in the Union," and a sober consideration of the immense and varied resources of State must persuade one that this is not extravagant praise. The population of this great State, which, if its centre were placed at Nashville, would touch Chicago on its northern boundary, Raleigh, N. C., on the east, Mobile on the south, and Little Rock on the west; the population of this empire State is but a little more than 3,000,000, whereas it is easily capable of supporting a population of 50,000,000, for Japan, with more than a third less territory, has a total population to-day of perhaps more than 50,000,000.

The possibilities of Arkansas are scarcely less than those of Texas in proportion to its size, for it abounds in mineral wealth,

Digitized by Google

possesses forests that have given it front rank among the lumber producing States; and it contains thousands of acres of fertile farming lands that are capable of supporting a teeming population. Nor will Oklahoma and Indian Territory suffer by comparison with these States of such splendid resources. Their climate is bracing yet equable; they have large tracts of very productive farm lands that are but sparsely settled; and in Indian Territory are abundant deposits of coal, petroleum, and asphalt. After many years of waiting the vexed land question in Indian Territory has been settled, and now that statehood for the two as a single State is about to be realized, thousands of people are flocking there annually, and the State enters upon its career with the promise of unexampled prosperity.

The railroad corporations, appreciating the possibilities that are presented by the present conditions in this vast section that God has so wonderfully endowed, are extending their lines in every direction, in many instances looking to the future for their dividends. They are exploiting this great Southwest with a persistence, and advertising with a genius, and on a scale never before seen anywhere, with results that it does not require a prophet to forecast.

In such a juncture the Church ought to send out its representatives throughout this section—men of tact, foresight, and consecration—who shall plant churches wherever communities are forming, assist them in the erection of houses of worship, and keep them supplied with preaching until they are able to sustain themselves. Such an aggressive policy would be, of course, call for a large expenditure of money; but with the same sagacity and intelligent grasp of the situation that business men are showing we can easily believe that such a policy, if persistently and wisely pursued, would in a few years more than justify itself. The Church to which the writer now ministers is a striking confirmation of the correctness of this opinion.

Less than ten years ago a man came direct from Union Seminary, in Virginia, to take charge of it on a salary of $500.00 a year, *half of which was paid by the Home Mission Committee;* but under his vigorous and able leadership it grew rapidly into a self-supporting church. It pays its present pastor three times the amount specified above, maintains three flourishing Sabbath-schools, contributes liberally to all the benevolent causes of the

Digitized by Google

Assembly, and carries ten shares of stock in the Nagoya Mission in Japan. It is not likely that every church organized will yield such gratifying results as this, but many other churches in this great home mission field might be cited whose rapid growth warrants the belief that in every case where wisdom is shown in founding a church, and it is properly cared for, the results will far more than justify what it has cost the Church.

A minister of our Church, writing from what is popularly known as Southwest Texas, that Governor Herrick characterized as "the richest section of the greatest State in the Union," says: "This country is open now for the preaching of the Gospel, for at present it is given over to the devil, and the first church upon the ground ready to push its work is the church that will dominate it for the future. But *now,* if *ever,* is the time to enter." Nor does it require the vision of a seer to see that this great Southwestern section of the country, comprising Arkansas, Indian Territory, Oklahoma and Texas, that is capable of supporting more than ten times its present population, and to whose borders thousands of people are flocking annually, drawn thither by its splendid resources, presents an opportunity for Home Mission work greater and more alluring than ever before confronted a church. We begin to realize the brightness of its promise when we consider that the day is not far distant when there will be in this great Southwest nearly twice as many people as there are to-day in all the territory now occupied by our General Assembly, and if we push our work with the vigor that the opportunity demands, we shall have more members upon what is now a Home Mission field than we have in all the Church combined at present. The bearing of this upon our Foreign Mission work is so apparent, and how vitally its future is linked with Home Missions is so evident, that a bare reference to it here is sufficient.

Not only, however, are the opportunities alluring, but in this great growing section there are actual needs for the Gospel that ought to appeal to us with an eloquence peculiarly their own. Not long since the writer had a letter from a Presbyterian, a mining engineer, who was superintending at the time the opening of some quicksilver mines in West Texas, in which the following statement occurs: "The nearest church to us here is about 100 miles away, and there has been only one sermon preached

Digitized by Google

in this district during the last seven years." That statement reveals an utter destitution of the Gospel that ought to appeal profoundly to the heart of a church to which God has given a rare vision of its duty to a lost world, and we believe it would if the Church could be made to realize that destitution. Everywhere throughout this southwestern country, in the rapidly developing Indian Territory and Oklahoma, and in Arkansas, as well as in Texas, may be found communities whose religious influences are meagre and whose church privileges are utterly inadequate.

Throughout Southwestern Texas there exists an especial need of which we believe the Church at large is scarcely aware, and yet from the very nature of the case it ought to appeal strongly to every heart that is interested in Foreign Mission work. It is the presence of more than 100,000 Mexicans, who need the Gospel just as much as do their brethren across the border, whom our Church has made objects of Foreign Mission work. These Mexicans may be found assembled in little communities of their own in every city or town in Southwest Texas, ignorant of the Gospel, yet untouched by the churches of their own race, because they speak but little, if any, English, and live upon a plane that altogether removes them from the social and religious life of the community in which they dwell. Even more than the cotton mill population of the Southeast, they present a separate problem for the Church to solve, and if reached at all, it must be through special effort on their behalf. Our Committee of Home Missions therefore makes an especial appropriation for this Mexican work, and besides supporting the men from our own Church, who direct the work, it also assists as far as it is able the native evangelists as well as helping in the erection of church buildings. The amount of funds available for this work, however, is always painfully inadequate, and it seems likely that it will become even more inadequate in the near future unless the Church enables our committee to increase the appropriation for the most recent reports from the Bureau of Immigration show that there is a continual influx of population from Mexico to this country.

A moment's reflection will lead us to see that there is no more truly Foreign Mission work on home soil than this, and it becomes particularly attractive when we consider its important

Digitized by Google

bearing upon our work in Mexico. Numbers of these Mexicans return to their own country after a few years residence in Texas, and, if during their stay among us they become Christians, they become on their return to the homeland centers of Christian influence that are of inestimable value in the evangelization of their own country.

The actual statistics show that Presbyterians in Texas outrank the rest of the Church in their per capita gifts for the support and spread of the gospel, and while we recognize that we are not pushing our work with all the fidelity and vigor that these splendid opportunities and needs call for, yet much is being done to meet these needs. They have churches and manses to build, one male college, a co-educational college, a female college, and a theological seminary to equip and endow; and on every hand the work is so great and the needs multiply so rapidly that they cannot do it all. Unless, therefore, it is undertaken by the entire Church much of it must be neglected.

The door of opportunity stands wide open before us now—such an opportunity as never before confronted a church; and we have but to enter, impelled by every motive of church pride, and moved by the actual spiritual destitution of our brethren. It is the opportunity presented by a great empire, whose settlement and development are as yet but scarcely begun. Our Church is already well established in this great Southwest, and with a large vision of the future has founded the educational institutions that are essential to her success. But if we are going to enter this open door, we must do it now, or else in a few years find it closed, and closed forever. Other denominations are pushing their work here vigorously, and are rapidly occupying the territory that we ought to help them claim for Christ.

It is the great opportunity of the Church to expand, to broaden the base upon which to build its future, and from which to achieve larger usefulness in bringing the millions who sit in heathen darkness into the marvellous light of the Gospel of Christ—if we neglect it, we doom ourselves to a circumscribed career, and restricted usefulness for all time.

It is said that one morning General Robert E. Lee, who was then stationed at Fort Sam Houston, at San Antonio, was standing on a slight eminence that commanded a splendid view of the surrounding country, and looking intently out into space

Digitized by Google

as though he heard something. A fellow officer approached him, and asked what he was doing, to which Lee replied: "I am listening to the tramp of on-coming millions." Oh! that our beloved Church might catch the prophetic spirit of General Lee, for then would she hear the call of the great Southwest that comes to her to-day, and make to it a response worthy of the opportunities and needs that it voices—a response that shall be in every way worthy of the Church we love!

Digitized by Google

UNION SEMINARY MAGAZINE.

EDITORIAL STAFF.

DAVID HOPKINS ROLSTON, *Editor.*

ALFRED S. ANDERSON, *Associate Editor.*
GASTON BOYLE, *Missionary Editor.*
S. MC. P. GLASGOW, *Associate Editor.*
LYLE MOORE MOFFETT, *Associate Missionary Editor*

PROF. W. W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D., *Review Editor.*
PROF. T. C. JOHNSTON, D. D., LL. D., *Review Editor.*
THOMAS W. HOOPER, JR., *Book Editor.*
HUGH H. HUDSON, *Business Manager.*

Published bi-monthly during the Seminary session by the students of Union Theological Seminary, in Virginia.

Change of address, discontinuance, or failure to receive the Magazine regularly should be reported promptly by mail to the Business Manager.

Terms: One dollar a year, in advance; single copy, twenty-five cents.

Editorial.

The Seminary students have been treated to some able lectures on interesting and timely subjects this year. Mr. Marion Lawrence, out of his abundant experience and life-long study of the subject, gave us six lectures on Sunday-school work. Mr. Cameron Johnson gave us a series of missionary lectures illustrated by splendid stereopticon views, in which we all felt that he brought the East very near to us. Rev. Harris E. Kirk, D. D., of Baltimore, gave us a lecture dealing with the question, "Does the theory of cosmic-evolution satisfactorily account for Christ and Christianity?" These lectures have been a great benefit to us all. It is certainly a blessing to young men that they can have the opportunity of profiting by the experience and study of their seniors.

We were especially anxious to publish Dr. Kirk's lecture in order that all our readers might have the benefit of his careful study of this subject. We found, however, that he had already promised it to *The Princeton Review,* to which we refer our readers who desire to possess themselves of a clear and masterly treatment of this subject so much discussed in some quarters to-day.

Digitized by Google

Our plans for our next issue, dealing with the eldership and the diaconate of our Church, are maturing. Rev. D. K. Walthall, Ph. D., prepares a paper reviewing the ordination vows of these officers. Dr. English will publish an article dealing with the scriptural warrant and qualifications for these offices. Hon. A. M. Scales, of Greensboro, N. C., a wide-awake and useful elder, will write along the line of the demands of the present day on the eldership. There will be other interesting subjects discussed by able writers. The Missionary Department is gathering a series of short sketches of the elder and deacon in the native church on the foreign field from those who have served as missionaries in the different foreign lands. We feel confident that the whole number will be one of interest to all our church officers and others as well. We wish that a copy of it could go to every deacon and every elder in our bounds. We believe pastors may well call the attention of these officers to it. Extra copies of it may be had at the regular rate by ordering from the business manager not later than March 15th.

D. H. R.

We make no apology for leaving out editorial matter save these few announcements, for in the present issue we have timely themes treated by able men, and we will not even put ourselves in where we have something better to take up the space.

The book department is also omitted from this issue for lack of space, but will be given full space next time.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

Union Seminary Magazine

VOL. XVIII APRIL—MAY, 1907 No. 4

THE ELDER AND THE DEACON IN SCRIPTURE.

BY REV. T. R. ENGLISH, D. D.

The most primitive form of government known to man is that in which authority is exercised by those superior in age and wisdom, "elders;" and the first who filled this office was Adam, the natural head and ruler of his house. Traces of this primitive custom are still to be seen in the names applied to rulers at the present time, such as, "senators," "alderman," etc.

The term "elder," as an official title, occurs first in Genesis l. 7, where mention is made of "the elders of Egypt." At the time of the Exodus we find "the elders of Israel" exercising authority over that people, nor was the institution by any means confined to that people, as we find mention also of the elders of Moab and Midian, (Num. xxii. 4, 7). From this time on to the close of the Old Testament, we find constant mention made of these "elders of Israel," and, besides these, each tribe and city and village seems to have had its own elders, who exercised a local and subordinate authority.

These elders were primarily civil rulers, as is manifest by their functions, but they had also their religious and ecclesiastical functions as well. When the synagogue made its appearance after the Exile, we find that each synagogue had its bench of elders, and while they apparently still exercised certain civil functions, it is evident that they were primarily ecclesiastical rulers. They are referred to in the New Testament as "the rulers of the synagogue" (Mark v. 22; Acts xiii. 15; Cf. also, Luke vii. 41), and also as "the elders of the Jews" (Luke vii. 3). Apparently, there was one of their number who acted as pre-

Digitized by Google

siding officer, and hence spoken of as "the ruler of the synagogue" (Mark v. 35, 36, 38, Luke viii. 49, xiii. 14), and also as "the chief ruler of the synagogue" (Acts xviii. 8, 17). If we may trust the statements of rabbinical writers, these elders were elected by the people, examined and ordained, and were the only officers who were ordained, even those who "preached" not being required to submit to this rite until a late period. (Edersheim). As rulers of the synagogue, they had charge of the services, and it was their prerogative to designate the persons who were to read the scriptures and the prayers, and also to address the people, or preach, as may be seen in the incident related in Acts xiii. 15ff., where Paul and Barnabas were invited by them to address the people in the synagogue in Antioch. While it is not expressly stated that these elders themselves taught the people and expounded the scriptures, it is more than probable that they had the right, and did so whenever occasion required, as seems to be implied in the fact that they were examined and ordained, and it would be passing strange if they could give authority to others to do what they themselves had no right to do.

Such, in brief, was the situation in the Jewish Church at the beginning of the Christian dispensation. Be it remembered that there was never any formal organization of the Christian Church, as distinguished from the Jewish. It gradually developed out of the latter, as the fruit follows the flower, without any clear line of separation between the two. Just as the Methodist Church began in the bosom of the Established Church, without so much as a dream of separation at first, so looking at it from a human standpoint, the Christian Church, as it is popularly called, grew out of the Jewish, without any thought of separation upon the part of those who first composed it. It was pre-eminently a growth and development, and hence we may look for no more than a gradual modification of existing institutions and customs, as occasion might demand.

When we come to the New Testament we find the term "elder," as an official designation in the Christian Church, occurring eighteen times, besides a number of other passages where the office is clearly referred to, though the term "elder" is not used. The first mention occurs in Acts xi. 30, at least a decade and a half after Pentecost, and about midway of the

Digitized by Google

period covered by the Book of Acts, where aid was sent by the Antiochan Church to the famine-stricken brethren at Jerusalem, and was put in the hands of the elders of the church. No mention is made whatever of the institution of such an office, and it is evident that this institution, so familiar to these Christian Jews, had quietly and naturally found a place among these people who practically, though not formally, had separated from the synagogue. The next mention is in Acts xiv. 23, some two or three years later, when we find Paul and Barnabas "ordaining elders in every city" among their Gentile converts.

But what were the functions of these elders? We would naturally expect that they would conform very closely to those of the same officials in the synagogue, excluding, of course, all civil functions, but this presumption must be confirmed by more positive and direct evidence.

That they exercised rule is clear not only from their position in the Jeweish Church, but we find them sitting in the council at Jerusalem, and in conjunction with the apostles, deciding a question submitted to them by the church at Antioch, (Acts xv. 2, 6, 22, etc.). In 1 Tim. v. 17, we read of "the elders that rule well." Three times in the Epistle to the Hebrews mention is made of "them that have the rule over you" (xiii. 7, 17, 24), where the reference is clearly to the elders, at least in part.

But ruling, in the narrow sense, was not their sole function. We find that elders or "presbyters," (the Greek form of elder, and hence "presbytery" and "presbyterian"), were also called "bishops," (overseers), as may be seen by referring to Titus i. 5, 7, where these two terms are undeniably used interchangeably. This is also apparent from Paul's address to the "elders" of Ephesus, (Acts xx. 7), whom he exhorts to "take heed to all the flock, in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops." (xx. 28, R. V.). In this same passage he charges them to "feed" the church of God, so that it devolved upon them, not only to rule the church, but to give them spiritual food, even as a shepherd feeds as well as rules his flock. Indeed the word rendered "feed" means to act the part of a "shepherd" or "pastor," and includes all the functions of such an office.

Among the qualifications required in the elders, whom Titus was to ordain in every city in Crete, occurs this: "Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able

Digitized by Google

by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince gainsayers." (Titus i. 9.) In the parallel passage, 1 Tim. iii. 2-7, it is required of bishops that they should be "apt to teach." Now, when it is borne in mind that "elder" and "bishop" are unquestionably used interchangeably in the first of these passages, and by parity of reasoning in the second, and elsewhere; and when we bear in mind the fact that these are the only two passages in which the qualifications of elders and bishops are specifically set forth, and when we further remember that in both of these passages the teaching, as well as the ruling function, clearly appears, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that religious instruction was one of the prime functions of the New Testament elder. Indeed, if the elders ordained by Paul and Barnabas on their first missionary tour did not preach and teach by virtue of their office, who gave instruction to these infant churches and conducted their worship when the apostles left them for other fields of labor, and whence did they get their first "preacher"? and who taught the church in Crete so recently founded? That these primitive elders were responsible for the religious instruction of the people, as well as for their government, is perfectly clear, but that some of them were ordained specifically to preach, while others were specifically restricted to the function of rule, cannot, we believe, be demonstrated, to say the least of it; and in view of all the circumstances of the case, it seems far more likely that among these elders those whose gifts fitted them more especially for such work, naturally and gradually devoted themselves to the work of public teaching. The first and only passage in which this distinction appears is 1 Tim. v. 17, in which Paul says: "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine." As we understand it, the point which the apostle is making here is that fidelity upon the part of church rulers should be recognized and rewarded, and if, on the other hand, this fidelity is lacking, they should be reproved before all upon proper evidence (vs. 19, 20). The fundamental idea underlying the office of elder is that of authority, and this passage might be paraphrased in some such way as this: "Let all faithful rulers in the church be counted worthy of all honor (*i. e.*, maintenance and respect), and especially those engaged in the arduous work of giving public instruction." It is true that

Digitized by Google

our form of government distinguishes sharply between the teaching and ruling elder, requiring a separate and distinct ordination for each, and we believe that, by reason of changed circumstances, such an arrangement is eminently wise and desirable, if not absolutely necessary, but we fail to find a "thus saith the Lord for it," as in the case of many other wise regulations in our Book of Church Order. In our judgment, an elder has far more authority to "preach" than an unlicensed theological student, and while we do not advocate the formal and authoritative preaching of the Word by either, we long to see the day when our so-called ruling elders will come to realize that they are truly "pastors," and will seek to "feed the church of God," bound by their office to be teachers of religion, and to watch for souls, even though they may not stand in the sacred desk and formally preach the Word.

We have dwelt so long upon the elder that we have but little space left in which to speak of the other part of our topic—the Deacon in Scripture; nor is this to be especially regretted, seeing that there is but little said in Scripture as to this office.

It is generally held that the office had its prototype in the synagogue, and was derived from it, just as in the case of the elder, but this is doubtful to say the least of it, and is denied by many competent antiquarians. In the New Testament it is usually traced to the incident of the appointment of the Seven, recorded in Acts vi. 1-6, but it is by no means certain that these seven were deacons in this sense, and some competent scholars take the view that this was only a temporary arrangement to meet an emergency. In support of this view, attention is called to the fact that these men are not called "deacons" in the narrative; that there is no further reference to the existence of such a body in the church at Jerusalem; that upon a later occasion, when Paul and Barnabas carried relief to the brethren in Jerusalem, they delivered it to the elders, and not the deacons; that the first indisputable mention of the office occurs in Phil. i. 1, more than thirty years after Pentecost; and that the institution of the diaconate would normally follow, and not precede, that of the higher and more important office of the eldership. These considerations are not without weight, but, while it may not have been the actual beginning of this office, it was at least the forerunner of it, and forecasted the duties of the office.

Digitized by Google

In contrast with the elder, the deacon is mentioned by name in only two passages in the Bible, the word itself, as an official designation, occurring but five times, leaving out certain disputed passages. In the first of these passages (Phil. i. 1), the deacons are simply mentioned along with the "saints" and "bishops" (*i. e.*, private members and elders) as one of the constituent elements of the church, so that the passage throws no light upon the nature of the office or its functions. In the other passage (1 Tim. iii. 8-13), the apostle sets forth first of all the qualifications of the deacon, which are all moral and spiritual, and are almost identical with those of the elder or bishop. In the case of the latter the church is warned against the danger of committing the office to "a novice" (1 Tim. iii. 6), and so with reference to these inferior officers it is provided: "And let them first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless" (vs. 10). Furthermore, while the office is inferior in dignity and usefulness to that of the elder, yet it is by no means to be despised, "for they that have used the office of a deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus" (vs. 13).

It is a noteworthy fact that if we leave out of view the narrative in Acts vi. 1-6, there is not a word in scripture as to the duties of deacons, and hence a variety of views as to the proper scope of their duties. We might say something about the so-called "deaconesses" in the New Testament, but our limits forbid the discussion of this vexed question at this time.

Digitized by Google

THE OBLIGATION OF THE ELDER AND DEACON.

By D. K. Walthall, Ph. D.

"Better is it that thou shouldest not vow, than that thou shouldest vow and not pay." (Ecc'l v. 5.) In accordance with this principle our church has been careful in requiring vows or obligations of her members. There is an obligation taken by the minister when he is licensed, ordained and installed; by the other church officers when they are inducted into office; by the church member when he professes his faith in Christ, and reciprocal obligations of church members to their officers. Besides these I know not if there be any other. These vows, then, being few in number and confined to the most solemn acts of religious life, receive thereby their proper dignity and importance. We see, therefore, that the matter under discussion is a serious one. No doubt every true elder and deacon has felt this in a way; but has not that "way" been sometimes similar to the conception which Tennyson's northern farmer had of his relation "to his pastor"?

"An I never knawed what a mean'd, but I thowt a 'ad somwat to saäy,
An I thowt a said whot a owt to 'a said an I coome'd awaäy."

Have not some of our elders and deacons the idea that the obligation they assume is something very important, solemn and appropriate, but fail largely to understand in what the importance, solemnity and appropriateness consist? The aim of this article is to show what is really involved in this obligation, and thus set forth the offices of elder and deacon in their scriptural proportions and importance. On being inducted into office the ruling elder and deacon is required to answer five questions (Form of Government, § 112-II.

1. "Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice?" Doubtless all of our church officers accept heartily this doctrine of the complete inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and, thus far, well. But when our church makes as its *first test* for office bearing a belief in the inerrancy of the

Digitized by Google

Scriptures this requires, on the part of the officer not only an *implicit faith* in the inspiration of the Scriptures, but also a *well-grounded faith*—that is, a faith based on a settled intellectual conviction that the Scriptures are the Word of God, and this conviction reached after a careful consideration of the various lines of proof by which this doctrine is established. This does not imply that elders and deacons are to have the same fullness of knowledge on this subject which the minister is supposed to possess, but it does imply that they ought to possess sufficient knowledge to enable them to give a reason for their faith on this all-important question.

2. "Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith and the Catechism of the Church as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures?" An affirmative answer to this question implies two things—(1) that every church officer ought to have sufficient knowledge of the Scriptures not only to be able to demonstrate their inerrancy, but also to be able to test a system of faith like that contained in the Standards of our Church, and (2) that he has actually tested our system by the Scriptures and has found it to be correct in all essentials. No doubt in this study the Shorter Catechism has proved an invaluable aid, but the study of this noble document by our church officers cannot relieve them of the obligation to study and comprehend the yet richer and fuller exposition of divine truth as contained in our other standards, and especially in the Confession of Faith. The Presbyterian Church has always been the bulwark of orthordoxy, but how much greater would that bulwark prove in these evil days of rampant liberalism if all our officers were saturated with the vitalizing and energizing influence of our confession and possessed a thorough acquaintance with the whole system of doctrine and the logical relation of the parts to the whole which a careful study of that document would impart!

3. "Do you approve of the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States?" Our standards are divided into two parts—(1) those which concern what the church is to believe. The Confession of Faith and the Catechism belong here. (2) Those which concern the form in which the church life expresses itself. Here we find the Book of Church Order embracing the form of government, rules of discipline

Digitized by Google

and directory of worship. It is the Book of Church Order with which we are now concerned. A knowledge of this book is indispensable to office-bearers, as their work consists primarily in ruling. The portion of our standards relating to this subject should therefore receive their careful study. Moreover, there ought to be the same kind of comparative study of Scripture and the standards here as that suggested in the preceding section; for it is the boast of our church that we do or say nothing for which we can not produce a "thus saith the Lord," or which can be deduced by good and necessary inference therefrom. It would, no doubt, be a revelation of great joy to many a faithful elder and deacon if, through a diligent study of the Scripture he should discover how much is there said of these officers and how closely these officers correspond to their Scripture counterpart. That such a study may be both easily and profitably carried on by the ordinary layman is shown by the incident recently related by Dr. S. H. Chester, of the church at Araguary, Brazil, which was organized after a careful study of the Scriptural church polity and without the influence of any missionary by the election of elders and deacons.

4. "Do you accept the office of ruling elder or deacon, as the case may be, in this church, and promise faithfully to perform all the duties thereof?" Our book defines the duties of the elder and deacon as follows: (1) The elder (Form of Government, §§ 43, 45): "These ruling elders . . . possess the same authority and eligibility to office in the courts of our church as the ministers of the Word. . . Ruling elders, the immediate representatives of the people, are chosen by them, that, in conjunction with the pastors or ministers, they may exercise government and discipline, and take the oversight of the spiritual interests of the particular church, and also of the church generally, when called thereunto. It appertains to their office, both severally and jointly, to watch diligently over the flock committed to their charge, that no corruption of doctrine or of morals enter therein. Evils which they cannot correct by private admonition they should bring to the notice of the Session. They should visit the people at their homes, especially the sick; they should instruct the ignorant, comfort the mourner, nourish and guard the children of the church, and all those duties which private Christians are bound to discharge by the law of charity

Digitized by Google

are especially incumbent upon them by divine vocation, and are to be discharged as official duties. They should pray with and for the people; they should be careful and diligent in seeking the fruit of the preached Word among the flock, and should inform the pastor of cases of sickness, affliction and awakening, and of all others which may need his special attention." What more need be added to this splendid summary of the elder's duties? It is commended to every elder in our church for careful, prayerful and repeated study while remembering that he has vowed in the sight of God and his people "faithfully to perform all the duties" therein set forth. (2) The Deacon (Form of Government, § 47): "The duties of this office especially relate to the care of the poor, and to the collection and distribution of the offerings of the people for pious uses, under the direction of the Session. To the deacons, also, may be properly committed the management of the temporal affairs of the church." While there is a very decided contrast between the duties of the elder and deacon, yet the latter office is by no means to be despised, for it is concerned with the finances of the church. Who is there who does not know that, in the great mercantile establishments of the day, the financial man is the very life of the business? While the object of the church's existence is far different from accumulating wealth, yet it is impossible to do systematic religious work without money. Men must live, and "they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar." The deacon in making all the secular arrangements necessary to the church's life is like the stoker in the great vessel who supplies the fuel which furnishes the energy that speeds the ship to its desired haven. Moreover, we ought not to overlook the emphasis which both the Scriptures and our Book lay upon this office as being primarily for the sake of the poor. It was for such work that the original seven were appointed, and it is in such work that the true deacon of to-day will find his greatest joy and his richest reward.

5. "Do you promise to study the peace, unity, edification and purity of the Church?" After what has been said, it is needless to enlarge on this question, as all will recognize the impossibility of discharging the duties inculcated in this section, unless the obligations of the previous sections have been met and the ease with which these duties may be discharged, if the former duties

Digitized by Google

have been discharged. How can an officer study the peace, unity and purity of the church unless by a previous study of God's Word he has discovered in what the real peace, unity and purity of the church consist? and how can one *edify* his fellow Christian as to the meaning of God's Word and the standards of our church until by faithful study of the same he has understood their meaning and learned to rejoice in their moral beauty and spiritual glory? If, on the other hand, this knowledge has been obtained, how easy to impart its blessed power! What solemn obligations and of what vast import are these which are assumed by our elders and deacons—obligations which should give each one of them occasion for prayerful meditation and renewed consecration. Yet, in the discharge of these sacred duties he will have two things to aid him: (1) The comforting assurance that he is working for God and the advancement of His kingdom in a position of dignity and importance, and that God will not suffer His Word to return unto him void, but will prosper it in the thing unto which He has sent it. (2) The officer will receive the sympathy and active aid of the true people of God over whom He rules and who will, if he proves faithful, be ever ready to discharge their obligation, which is that they, the members of the particular church in which he bears rule "acknowledge and receive him as a ruling elder (or deacon), and promise to yield him all that honor, encouragement and obedience in the Lord, to which his office, according to the Word of God and the Constitution of this Church, entitles him." (Form of Government, § 112-II.

Digitized by Google

THE PEOPLE IN CHURCH ELECTIONS.

By Rev. C. R. Vaughan, D. D.

1. It is a fundamental principle in the New Testament system of ecclesiastical polity that all the officials of the organization shall be elected by the body of the brotherhood. No pastor can lawfully assume charge of a Christian Congregation without the choice of the people. In those instances where a pastor is appointed by any other authority there lies back of the appointment an authority which is different from that recognized in the New Testament. Government appointments to chaplaincies are appointments to the use of official functions for specific government purposes—functions already conferred by proper ecclesiastical authority—and therefore not conferred by the act of the government. The present inquiry, however, has reference to the regular administration of the church in its ordinary and constant course, and not to those occasional and not numerous cases of specific appointments to meet specific demands for ministerial services. The general law of the Christian kingdom is clearly settled in the sixth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. It makes law for the entire Christian body on all the earth, and for all time. This law is recognized as of absolute authority in the Presbyterian Church.

2. The second principle to be recognized is the logical and necessary consequence of the principle just stated. If the lawful election of all the officers of the church is placed in the hands of the people, who constitute the body of the church, every member, without exception, should feel an indelible responsibility for doing his part in the choice of pastors, elders and deacons when call is made for an election of any one or all of these officers. Unhappily, it is far too often the case that when an election is ordered by the authorities of the church, and the people are called upon to exercise a franchise which is lawfully imposed upon them and restricted to them, far too many of them will refuse to do it, and throw the responsibility upon others by leaving the church building. This is altogether wrong. By giving you a place in his church, God has laid this responsibility on you, whoever you may be, young or old, male or

Digitized by Google

female; and you cannot shirk it without sin. Even the youngest can usually ask advice touching their vote, and all can consult and find guidance that will be safe. On the choice of the people under their responsibility to God, rests the lawful use of all the offices of his kingdom.

3. It is the business of the voter to use his best efforts and opportunities to make the best available selection within his power. He is not bound to make the best choice *per se,* but the very best that is in reach. Hasty and ill-considered elections often fasten improper men on the church, under which it may suffer for years. If any man is notoriously and publicly known to be unfit for office, whether of pastor, elder or deacon, it is wisest to decline any election, rather than make a mistaken one, and take the chances of delay. Fitness for office is indispensable.

4. Fitness for one office is not necessarily fitness for any office. In the election for the eldership regard ought to be had in supreme degree to personal piety. It is also of great importance to have men who are intelligently and strongly attached to the doctrinal system for which the church stands before the world and before God. Errors sometimes creep in, and lay the foundation for trouble. Whether thus posted before election or not, it is the indispensable duty of the chosen elder to inform himself; or else he cannot be a faithful and wise watchman over the flock over which he has been made an overseer. One of the chief duties of an elder is to guard the purity of the doctrine taught to the people. An elder should be a man of sound judgment and have a heart full of charity and a merciful disposition. Often in the trials of accused members, delicate questions of character are involved; circumstances bearing on the issue are to be construed; the happiness of others beside the accused may be implicated, and the judges in the case ought to be men of judgment and kindly temper—men who not only fear God, but love both righteousness and mercy. Inasmuch as the elders are to act as a body, they ought to be men who are not of an imperious and self-asserting disposition; but both able and heartily willing to act in concert with others, and not disposed to have their own way, or else make trouble. We have known of a church actually ruined by a pragmatical elder. A practical rule which ought to be observed in the election of elders is this: Since the duties of this office call for so much prudence and discretion,

Digitized by Google

piety and self-control, it is always wise to constitute the Session of experienced men in the middle and advanced period of life. But with a decisive majority of such a class, it is generally advisable to have one or two young men who can be in training for the duties of the eldership against the time when they will have the main burden cast over upon them. These young elders will often be more available than the older officers in certain kinds of action that may be called for in the business of the Session—such as attending distant meetings of the higher courts in rough parts of the Presbyterial bounds, or in taking laborious records of evidence in cases under trial. As the general characters of men are generally well known in the communities where they reside, the voter who is to select them for this important office need feel no oppression in making up his choice.

5. The office of the deacon in the New Testament system, as construed and adopted in the Presbyterian branch of the kingdom, is one of the noblest and most important of all its offices. Yet it is less understood and more completely lost in its actual administration to its main design and purposes than any other of the divinely appointed arrangements of the Head of the Church. The deacon's office is well nigh universally taken to be nothing but an office of finance. Every kingdom must, of course, have its revenue laws and its revenue officers. This function is of great importance. But an inspection of the circumstances under which the deacon's office was appointed will show that it was originally established as a guardian to the poor and the widows of the Christian community. The office was the exponent of that character in the Church of Christ which made it as much of an institution for the charities of the Christian heart—for the care of the poor, the sick and the defenceless stranger, the guardians and advisors of the widows and orphans of the Church of our Lord, as if that was the only function of the institution. Christ, during his life on earth, was pre-eminently distinguished for his sympathy with the temporal ills of humanity; and it would have been most remarkable if he had made no recognition of them in the permanent arrangements of his organized kingdom. This, however, he has done in the appointment of the deacon's office; and great harm has been done by some branches of the church by the alteration of this office from a function which represents and insists upon this beautiful

Digitized by Google

character in the church, to a mere function of teaching in a lower class of the ministry as in the Prelatic churches; or a mere function of administration and all-work in the Congregational or Independent systems. The church is thus stripped of one glorious facet in its jewelled beauty. The widows and orphans of Christ have lost their guardians and advisers appointed for their protection by their compassionate Lord. The church itself is discounted before a gain-saying world; and the personal growth in grace and beautiful holiness is hindered by withdrawing from before their eyes the eminent requirement of the church of their affections, for all the saints to give themselves to the sympathies and cares of caring for the sons and daughters of affliction. The poor have lost their helpers, save so far as the loss of regular and organized assistance is made up by personal acts of Christian kindness. The stranger has lost his guides, the sick their compassionate nurses, and the church one of her chief glories! The Lord of the kingdom stands clear of all this robbery and mischief; for his arrangements to secure them all have been abolished from the organization of his church by the carelessness, ignorance, and unfaithfulness of his misguided servants. All this will be altered in some favored future day, and when the implication of this noble office of the deacon are wrought out as they ought to be, and as they will be, into the visible presentment of the Glorious Kingdom of the blessed God, then the church will appear fair as the moon, clear as the sun, terrible as an army with banners, and beautiful as the garden of God, the merciful and gracious!

As suggested in the case of the eldership, the men of the diaconate should be chiefly chosen from the young and active servants of the Master, with always a small contingent of the older and wiser men. The reason for this suggestion is that the work of the Board of Deacons on one side of its noble purview calls for energy and resolute perseverance; and on the other for wise and sober counsels. The due mixture of the old and the young in their consultations will secure both. It is certain that all who serve the office of a deacon well, will purchase to each one of themselves a good degree and great boldness in the faith of the Lord Jesus. For there is great sanctifying and comforting power in the deacon's office well understood and well discharged. The mere financial side of the office is very valuable,

Digitized by Google

but there is no particular sanctifying power in that function of the office; but the chief end and aim of the diaconate discloses the meaning of the great apostle when he commends the sanctifying power of the deacon's functions in such strong and, to many, such mysterious terms. There is no mystery in his words, except when the office is construed as a mere incident to the finance of the kingdom.

Digitized by Google

"THE ELDER AS AN EVANGELIZING FORCE."

By W. S. McClanahan.

"The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being Lord's over God's heritage, but being examples to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away."—1 Peter v. 1-4.

With an earnest prayer for divine guidance, I shall endeavor to deal rather with conditions necessary to make the elder an evangelizing force, than with detailed suggestions as to methods of work. If the evangelization of the world is to be left to the regular ministry, and the members of his flock, and especially the officers of the Church of God, fail to grasp the meaning of the injunction of St. Paul, "Study to show thyself approved unto God, workmen that need not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth"—and simply attend to the ordinary routine business of the church, depending themselves upon hearing one or probably two sermons a week as practically the whole of their religious life, I feel that we do indeed need to be stirred up to better things. The elder under the solemn vows he has taken, and with the "love of Christ constraining him," if he fails to yield his life *absolutely* to Christ, that he may be so filled with His Spirit, that his (preferably the Christ) life is continually going out through him in evangelistic effort in one way or another, is coming far short of his privilege and responsibility. Without this absolute surrender of life, it is quite evident there is something held back in the life which is not only hurtful to his own life, but a stumbling block to those to whom he is supposed (and pledged) to be an example. What a solemn responsibility! He should not only teach, but, if necessary, preach, and "reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering." The text, "He that believeth on me as the Scripture hath said, out of his heart shall flow rivers of living water," is a sufficient answer

Digitized by Google

to any argument that we are not fitted for the various lines of evangelistic effort. We speak the things that we have seen and heard, as Christians we *know*. As to the giving of a gospel message by a church officer, or in fact any true Christian, I ask if anything would stand in the way of any living man's proclaiming to his neighbor the fact that his house was on fire and telling him the best means of escape, if he knows. How much more should we, especially the elders, proclaim out of a heart warm with the love of Christ and with a mighty passion for the souls of men, the danger, and point to the way of escape, Jesus Christ!

It has been said that in the case of probably 90 per cent. of the Christians whose lives seem powerless along evangelistic lines, that the reason is some personal sin in the life. Does this apply equally to our eldership? I leave the question open. The elder has the greatest field imaginable open to him for extending the Kingdom of Christ. There is no limit to his opportunities.

But, returning to the first thought of this article, I believe we are wholly unprepared to go forth to do God's work until we commit our lives entirely to Christ, and as a Gospel writer of prominence has well said, as unreservedly as we commit ourselves into the hands of the barber. We allow him dangerously near, and with a very sharp blade, in order that he may do his work well. This we must do in the Christian life if we are in earnest about the running of the race set before us. This is the vital point. It seems useless to exhort to a sense of duty and privilege, as men do not work satisfactorily from such motions; but when we have come to the place where we can look into His face, and with a steady gaze upon Him and a surrendered will, be renewed and transformed in His image, getting a vision of His glory, His kingdom, His church, His work, His rewards, His coming; then we can work joyously, continuously, feeling a thrill of pleasure at the thought that these things are to abide forever. Unlike Father Abraham, we are too often found nestling amid comfortable surroundings, making up our minds that this suits us, and not opening the life to the leading of God's spirit, when he might have other and better fields of labor for us. And then when we have learned the lesson of obedience, we want to be careful "not to be mindful of the country from which we came out, lest we have opportunity to return." One of our chief

Digitized by Google

troubles is in a proper letting go of the things we have given up for Christ. Unless we keep the eye steadfastly fixed on Him, we will find ourselves jumping on every wagon we see going back to the country from which we came out. I have simply given some thoughts as they occur to me, in a crude way, being as I see it, along the line preached for years by such men of God as Moody, Meyer, Morgan, Murray, Chapman, Mott, Speer, Gordon and others; and these truths, I think, sound the note of the forward movement in the church. Let us rise up as office-bearers and after tarrying until we are ready for the work, press forward as a mighty evangelizing force in the world—on to victory. There is much discussion in the world to-day as to what a Christian may or may not do; what a church officer may or may not do, even what the Minister may or may not do. This is very wearing and perplexing, but I take this opportunity to say that when the life is put in the right position before God and is "abiding in the secret place of the most high," these questionable things fall from the life as dead leaves from the tree in autumn. Some one has well said, "I will stand on no debatable ground." Can we as shepherds of the flock stand on any such ground?

There is nothing more attractive, more interesting, more inspiring, than the religion of Jesus Christ in its fulness. The cross always attracts, the message always thrills, if properly presented. There is nothing more unattractive than a cold, formal, "speak-as-if-you-did-not-mean-it, feel-it or live-it" religion; and upon this very thought God has spoken to us in Rev. iii. 16: "So then because thou art lukewarm and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth."

"Having a form of Godliness, but denying the power thereof."

Brethren, it should be a time of great heart-searching. If the life is right with God and spirit-filled, fruit will abound; if it is otherwise, it will not, and we will be "ashamed before Him at His coming."

Digitized by Google

THE BEST METHOD OF CULTIVATING THE GRACE OF LIBERALITY AND GATHERING THE OFFERINGS OF THE PEOPLE.*

By T. S. McPheeters, LL. D.

The subject that I shall attempt to treat has to do entirely with the benevolences of the church, and has nothing to do with the current expenses, such as pastor's salary, sexton, heat, etc. It is important that this should be borne in mind. Under the head of benevolences I would place the causes of the General Assembly, the work of the synod, the poor of our own church, and such other causes as become the Almoner of God. I will deal first with methods of cultivating the grace of liberality, and under this head would offer the following suggestions:

First. Attempt to awaken in the minds of the people the fact that we are the stewards of God. "We are not our own, but are bought with a price." This position exalts all work, and makes each feel that giving is as much an act of worship as praying. Until this spirit has been aroused, we may not hope for the best results. Without this spirit, giving is a matter of sentiment and impulse; so that unless these feelings are appealed to, we give nothing. When a man feels day by day, as he is engaged in his ordinary avocation, no matter how humble that avocation may be, that the great Maker of the Universe has honored him with a stewardship, and that if he will discharge that stewardship faithfully he will be rewarded the same as he who has done some great thing; new impulse is given to work; he will then pursue his avocation, not for the accumulation of wealth, not for his own personal advancement, but for wealth and personal advancement that he may with these things honor God. Money acquired in this spirit, though it may be a great fortune, will be a great blessing; while the man who works that he may have money for money's sake, though he amass a great fortune, will

*Papers read before The Deacon's Convention of the Presbyterian Churches of the Synod of Missouri, Grand Avenue Church, St. Louis, Mo., December, 1890.

Digitized by Google

have been moved by the lowest aspirations and his ambition will be one unworthy a man. Were this spirit of stewardship engendered in the hearts of the Christian Church, and taught by that church to the people, honoring and exalting, as it does, labor, and bring, as it does, responsibility to capital, many of the questions now agitating the country as to the relationship of capital to labor would be solved.

Second. Train the people to give regularly and systematically. The scriptural way is once a week; thus the amount is never large, and can therefore be more readily spared. Again, those who do not use system, always think they give much more than they really do. I remember soliciting a gift from a gentleman; and as I pressed the matter, he said that I was the fifth man that had solicited him that day. Upon which I remarked, that if he had given the others no more than he had given me, he was no poorer. Had I not made this remark, but left him, so given is the human mind to self praise, I doubt not that this gentleman, as he laid upon his couch at night, would have congratulated himself upon his great liberality, saying that the whole community seemed to be depending upon him. This illustrates the experience of many who do not give systematically. They exalt the times when they have felt liberal, until they seem to be occasions when they have been liberal. By systematic giving the people will learn to realize how little they really have given, and will therefore be led to give more liberally. Another advantage is in the case of small givers; they discover how large a sum, comparatively, they are really giving, when a small sum is set apart regularly. Without system, the small givers would feel that the sum they could give was too insignificant to have any bearing on the cause.

Third. Have all the people give, no matter how small the sum Teach them the power of littles. I know a church that gives $3,500 to benevolences, more than half of which, yes, two-thirds of which, come from those who give 25 cents and less per Sunday. If there be families in the church, have all the members give. This is far better than to allow one member to give all; it interests a larger number in the cause, and interest in the cause will lead to larger giving in the future. Children and young people trained to systematic benevolence in their youth, will

Digitized by Google

practice it in their old age; and if they can be led to see and know what is being accomplished with the money given, an interest in the church and its work will spring up in their hearts; and when they shall have grown to be men and women, taking the places of their fathers and mothers, it will be easy for them to give of their substance.

Fourth. Keep the people posted in regard to the causes towards which they are contributing by circulating among them literature from the committees of the General Assembly, from the Evangelistic Committee; also by clear and detailed reports of their own liberality. In this way they will be led to a deeper interest and larger giving.

Fifth. Urge the people to give a fixed proportion. I do not feel competent to discuss the great question that has been before our church for a year past (tithing), except to say that if the Jews, under the Law, gave a tenth, that I do not see how we, under Grace, could be willing to give less. Any person who practices systematic giving, must necessarily have some fixed proportion; otherwise there would be no system, and they would be unable to tell what they should give. Malachi iii. 10, says: "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in mine house; and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of Hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it." In the face of this verse, I don't believe that we would do wrong if we gave the Lord a tenth; and my experience has been, that those who are objecting to the tithing system are the ones who give much less than a tenth. William Thaw, of Pittsburg, who recently died leaving vast estates, I am told by a friend of mine who knew him personally, gave away for many years $1,000 per day; and whether at home or in his railroad office, he never allowed a worthy cause to appeal to him without responding. William E. Dodge, of New York, whose memory is precious to the Christian Church, was more than a tithe-giver for many years. Colgate, the great soap man, when on his way as a lad to New York, was asked by an acquaintance what he proposed to do. He said: "I have my mind made up on two points—first, to make soap in which I will put sixteen ounces to the pound, and, second, give a tenth of all that the Lord shall honor me with." He grew to be a man of great wealth, and is

Digitized by Google

to-day followed by worthy sons. A gentleman in our city, though naturally a close man, by the power of God's grace, when he entered into business for himself, put the Lord's name upon his books as a partner; and every year, when those books were balanced, the Lord's account got its tenth, and at the end of a long lifetime, when he had given away tens of thousands of dollars, he testified that the chiefest joy that he had in looking back over his life, was the money that he had been permitted to give the Lord. He to-day is followed by a worthy son, walking along in the path of his honored father. Cases without number could be cited of those who, believing the promise in Malachi, have been honored by God with wealth, and by their fellowmen with love, who have blessed the world and made it better. Now, this verse in Malachi may have been intended for the Jews; but these individual cases that I have cited show that it works pretty well with Christians. If you have any doubt on the subject, try it. A noble lady connected with my own church, who is a tithe giver, as her income is received, a tenth is separated and put apart; and when a worthy cause is presented, and she feels that her Master would be honored by its advancement, it is easy to give, because the money is there, instead of having to be taken away from her ordinary bank account. She remarked to me that, by having the amount set apart, it was as easy to give as if she were disposing of another's money, and the only thing to be considered, did Christ desire her to give. Dr. Houston, secretary of our Foreign Missionary Committee, during the time he was missionary to China, returned to America for a short period on account of his health. He accepted a country charge in Kentucky during that time. This church was greatly perplexed in collecting funds for its current expenses and the benevolences. They were paying him $700 per year. Finally, he made them a proposition, that if ten of them would tithe, he would not ask for any salary and would accept simply that which the elders gave to him. This was agreed on; so, as the farmers brought hay, wheat, oats or what not, to town, one-tenth of it was sold, and the proceeds given to the treasurer of the church. The women, as they sold their butter, eggs, cheese, etc., gave a tenth to the church; and, lo at the end of the year Dr. Houston received $800, the committees of the Assembly more than ever before, and all bore witness to the fact that financially the church had never enjoyed

Digitized by Google

as pleasant a year. This is the case of a small church in a country community.

Sixth. Avoid constant solicitations. How often the congregation chafes under constant appeals, so that both pastor and officers hesitate to make them. This can be done by settling the whole matter at the beginning of the year by the card system, that will be suggested later on. When once the people learn that undue solicitations will not occur, they more readily contribute to their full ability. I fear that too many of our ministers fail to impress upon their congregations the privilege and the blessings that flow from systematic giving, and, therefore, whatever money they get, is given in response to appeals. If ministers could have it brought strongly home to them that, by exalting the blessedness of giving, and the promises to those who do give, and the duty of all to give, and would so train their people, then their own needs would be more promptly met, the causes of the Assembly more liberally responded to, and the people themselves would be estopped from their complaining.

Seventh. Try to lead the people to feel that it is more blessed to give than to receive. This is the keynote of the Gospel. The arithmetic of the Gospel is: Give, and you have; keep, and you have not. This spirit destroys covetousness, and has no place for the love of money. This spirit can be brought about only by exalting in the minds of the people the proposition previously set forth at length, that we are the stewards of God, children of the King, and that whatever we do, whether we eat or drink, that we can do it in His name and for His glory. I now come to the second division:

BEST METHODS OF GATHERING THE OFFERINGS OF THE PEOPLE.

I will treat this objectively. The following card will explain what I mean:

Digitized by Google

The total of the sums apportioned here must equal the total offerings of the year.

$.....	**1. Home Missions. (Sustentation.)** To supplement the small salaries paid many of our devoted ministers.
$.....	**2. Foreign Missions.** To send missionaries to foreign lands to preach the Gospel.
$.....	**3. Education.** To aid young men in their preparation to preach the Gospel of Christ.
$.....	**4. Publication.** To provide Sabbath School Libraries and good books, tracts and lesson helps for our people, and general distribution.
$.....	**5. Invalid Fund.** For disabled Ministers, and for the widows and children of deceased ministers.
$.....	**6. Fund for Colored People.** To educate colored men for the ministry and sustain colored ministers as missionaries among their own race.
$.....	**7. Evangelistic.** To support evangelists in destitute fields in other States than our own.
$.....	**8. Sabbath School Fund.** To defray the expenses of our mission schools.
$.....	**9. Deacon's Fund.** For the support of the poor of our own church.
$.....	**10. Church Erection.** To aid weak congregations in erecting church buildings.
$.....	**11. Synodical Evangelistic Fund.** For evangelistic work in the Synod of Missouri.
$.....	**12. American Bible Society.**
$.....	**13.** For any object of your choice.
$.....	**14. General Fund.**
$.....	Total for year 52 weeks.

Please indicate how you wish the sum total of your offerings for the year divided, by marking above against the names of such objects as you may select the amount you wish to give.

All undesignated contributions will be added to the General Fund, which will be appropriated by vote of the Committee.

If, at any time during the year, you desire to make a special offering, it may be put in your envelope with a line indicating the object to which it is to be sent, and it will be forwarded by the Treasurer.

BENEVOLENT OFFERINGS OF THE

GRAND AVENUE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,

St. Louis, Mo.

$ .01
.02
.03
.05
.10
.15
.20
.25
.30
.50
.75
1.00
2.00
3.00
5.00
10.00
15.00
20.00
25.00

DIRECTIONS.

Please mark with an **X** in the column on the left, the sum you are willing to pledge as a **weekly offering** to the Lord for the year, using a blank space if you select a sum not mentioned.

Write your name and residence at the bottom of this card, and return it by mail to the Treasurer this week, or deposit it in the collection basket. next Sunday.

A package of small envelopes will then be furnished you (one for each week). The number on the envelope will correspond to your number on the Treasurer's book.

Each Lord's day enclose the amount of your weekly offering in the envelope bearing that date, seal it, and put it in the collection basket.

In case of absence for one or more Sundays, enclose the whole amount due with the next offering that is made, and destroy the envelopes that have not been used.

This pledge is between you and the Lord, is wholly voluntary, and may at any time be withdrawn by giving notice to the Treasurer.

For method of distributing the whole amount given, see reverse of this card.

Name .....

Residence .....

Digitized by Google

On one side of this card you see amounts varying from one cent to ten dollars, on the other side you see the various causes of the Assembly, Synod and local Church, together with a space called "general fund." Now the plan is, in December, to distribute these cards to every individual, man, woman and child in the congregation, requesting them to indicate on the side of the card where the money is, by cross-mark, what amount they are willing to give weekly; then have them turn over the card, and, having multiplied their weekly offering by 52, divide the sum obtained among the various causes indicated upon the card. Thus, if one were to give 10 cents per Sunday, they would divide $5.20. The cards so distributed, after being filled out and signed, are returned to the treasurer of the church, and to each one is sent 52 envelopes, one for each Sabbath of the year, into which their weekly offerings are placed. If you only have preaching once a month, as the family have these cards at their home, nothing prevents them from putting into the envelope each week the amount, and when Sunday comes on which they have preaching, take to church the four envelopes. The book-keeping connected with this plan will be treated by another gentleman, and therefore I shall not attempt to go into it, but will speak briefly on a few of the advantages of this system.

First. This way the people keep their own accounts and thus avoid trouble.

Second. When absent the giving goes on just the same. Under the old system, a good speech often got more than it ought, and a poor speech not what it ought. A bad Sunday does not affect the cause. To illustrate: Foreign Missions is presented once a year under the old system, and though you might be moved to give a large sum, you might not be able to do so, not having the money at hand just then; but under this system you could give a large sum, as it is divided through the whole year; and so with all the causes.

Third. It avoids constant solicitations (what a relief to some present). It prevents two or three bearing the burden which should be borne by all.

Fourth. No measuring of gifts; the whole matter between God and the individual. Moreover, small givers, whose gifts are too small to solicit, and who would be embarrassed by giving a small sum, are thus enabled to give.

Digitized by Google

Fifth. By a weekly offering, it is made part of our worship, and thus each week we are reminded of our stewardship, and of the honor God has placed upon us by making us stewards. Loss in this system is very small. Increase under this system has been 100 and 200 per cent., and givers have doubled and trebled. A church in 1874 that did not practice this gave $479. This scheme was put into practice in 1875, and they gave $1,686, and in 1876 $2,397.97. The Grand Avenue Church increased its givers in one year from 62 to 192, and its benevolences from $1,000 to $2,500. Already it has been objected by some that they do not know how much they can give. Then, in such a case, let them give what they know they can, and afterward increase the amount if they prosper. This system needs the hearty support of the pastor.

All that has been said will avail nothing, unless the people are led into sympathy with the first part of this paper—namely, the best methods of cultivating the grace of liberality.

Our Church is just entering upon an extended scheme for church extension and church strengthening under its Synodical Committee. This work can be forwarded only through the gifts of the people; but to us has been committed by God and Church the collecting of these gifts. Therefore, the Church is looking to us to devise ways and means for the great work that it is undertaking. If we are faithful, untiring and zealous in our work, we may hope to see a great revolution within our borders in the next decade; and it is this thought that has prompted me largely in all that I have said and attempted to suggest as to methods and modes. But be sure that it is true, that if we can bring the people up to a spirit of liberality, we will very materially assist in developing a spirit of piety, and in this way we shall honor our Master and be a blessing to our beloved Church, and earn for ourselves the praise of all those who love Christ and His kingdom.

Digitized by Google

THE LECTURES ON DIDACTIC AND POLEMIC THEOLOGY BY DR. C. R. VAUGHAN.

By Rev. Thomas C. Johnson, D. D.

At the close of his service in the chair of Didactic and Polemic Theology in Union Seminary, quite a number of the members of his classes went to Dr. Vaughan with expressions of gratification at the help they had received at his hands, and requested that he would put the lectures which he had delivered to them in a shape which would make them of permanent value. The condition of his arm, long affected with Scrivener's paralysis, made it uncertain whether any such promise could be fulfilled; and led him to decline to pledge himself to meet their wish. But, after some months, under the initiative of his pastor, the Rev. Dr. Campbell, of Roanoke, members of his classes clubbed together means and made him a present of a good typewriter. Thereupon he set himself to the task of meeting the wishes of his old students with reference to the preparation of his lectures for publication. The result is seventy-four elaborately prepared lectures, ready for the printers' hand.

The author states the objects aimed at in this work as follows:

"It is not intended for a scientific treatise on theology. My career as a teacher of the science was altogether too short to admit of such a scheme. Ten years of continuous service would have been the minimum period for such an attempt. The present work is simply designed to put into another form the controlling effort of my oral teaching to my classes. Instead of a scientific treatise, this scheme of instruction simply designs to be a *vade mecum* to students of books of a higher "grade." It aims to simplify, as far as my abilities would permit, the meaning of Christian doctrine. My effort as a teacher was to take the least prepared of the students, along with the better prepared. Technicalities are discarded, after explaining them; and the most lucid explanations adopted, from the foundation facts to the ultimate logical development of the subject. The satisfaction of my students was too often and too earnestly expressed to leave

Digitized by Google

me in doubt of my accomplishment of my design. A subsidiary design, in case the providence of God should order its appearance, was to furnish the working pastor of the church with clear, untechnical statements which would effectively aid their weekly preparation for the pulpit, without the more or less embarrassing technical terminology. Such a plan of statement would also be of service to intelligent but busy laymen of all classes, teachers in Sunday-schools and Bible classes, and thoughtful readers, male and female. It is not intended to compete with the noble work upon which as a text-book it is based. While occasionally differing from conclusions and modes of exposition in the text, no presumptuous thought of competing with the best intellect of his day, backed by thirty years of the most energetic practical training in his own chosen walk, ever entered into the head of one who was distinguished by the invaluable friendship of that grand old Christian thinker. On the contrary, this exposition waits on the nobler treatise to assist in showing its great merits, and recommends the interminable use of it in our theological schools. Entering life together, with strong personal affections, the direction of the Divine Providence led one of the friends into high position, with its strong stimuli to exertion, and undisturbed by evil health: it led the other into the narrower and inconspicuous occupation of a pastoral ministry, with its incompetent opportunities for special development. . . . Rivalry in science under "such circumstances, was out of all question." This work aims at the humbler preparation already defined."

Notwithstanding the exceedingly modest view which Dr. Vaughan takes of himself in this exposition of his purposes in preparing these lectures, they are the work of no mere servile expositor of Dabney's views. That might safely be inferred from the well-known character of the expositor. He is endowed with an irrepressible independence of thought and appetency and will. He is a bold, a vigorous, an "acute, a profound, and a powerful thinker." He "had long ago matured independent convictions." The careful reading of many of these lectures shows, indeed, that Vaughan and Dabney belonged to the same school of moderate Calvinists; and that, where Dabney's material presentation of a subject fully satisfied Vaughan, the latter devoted himself to the task of popularizing, as he could, the views set forth by the

Digitized by Google

older man; but it shows also that Dr. Vaughan is a free and an independent disciple, one spurred by his own original genius to the presentation, in his own way and from his own point of view, of truths common to him and to the Master, on whose work he comments. Hence the reader of these lectures feels in many instances, as in the eighth lecture, on the *Basis of Knowledge,* and in the twentieth, on the *Decrees of God,* that he is being treated to a brilliant, able and independent discussion of the subject, rather than to a commentary on the powerful discussion by Dr. Dabney. The reader of these lectures sees, too, that Dr. Vaughan does not hesitate to present new views; nor, on occasion, to attempt decided improvements on those presented by the great man whom he so admired and loved. He presents these improvements with the most marked deference to the name and memory of Dr. Dabney; but presents them with the assured confidence, clear-cut definitions and statements, and persuasive arguments of the masterful thinker.

Several instances of improvement on Dr. Dabney's presentations might be given. It will suffice to point to the lecture on "Predestination" and to that on "Imputation." Dr. Vaughan gives us a masterful discussion of Predestination, and surpasses Dabney—particularly in his treatment of the logical order of the several parts of the decree, the subject on which the supralapsarians and the sub-lapsarians were divided. He subjects the schemes of these parties, each to the most searching scrutiny, recognizes the elements of truth found in each contention; points out the defects in each, and then gives us his own scheme. It is the cleanest-cut, clearest and most satisfactory discussion of the subject which has fallen under our eyes. Certainly it is far ahead of the discussion of the same subject by Hodge, Shedd, or Dabney.

His chapter on "Imputation" is a master-piece. He espouses here the view of immediate imputation; and, in our judgment, he knifes effectually both the view of mediate imputation and the view that the distinction between Mediate and Immediate Imputation should never have been made.

The chapter on Imputation in Dr. Dabney's very able theology is perhaps the least convincingly agrued "chapter in the whole book." The alert eye of the "commentator" remarked this fact, and the suggested fact that the thesis of the chapter is faulty.

Digitized by Google

Modestly, but confidently, he takes the desk of the master and acquits himself with the highest success.

The limits assigned us for this notice precludes further references and specifications; but as we have poured over these lectures, the conviction has grown upon us, that probably Providence has shut out Dr. Vaughan from other kinds of work and shut him up to this, that he might serve Him in the production of these theological lectures. Certainly some of these lectures should be published and widely read. In our judgment, the entire set of seventy-four lectures should be published. Their publication would be an honor to our whole communion. Constituting a volume fully as large as the work on which they are professedly a commentary, they are from the pen of a master in the art of expression. They are redolent of rich culture. They are able, some of them brilliant, discussions of their themes. They are infiltrated with a sincere piety of the most intelligent and thoroughgoing type. They could not fail of great usefulness, if published and circulated. They are of such excellence that it would be a ground of just reproach to the church of the present should it fail to secure their publication. Should our church of the present not publish them, and should they be condemned to lie for long years in some out-of-the-way corner of a library, and where only an occasional eye shall look upon them, it is hoped that, in an age more devoted to thoroughgoing thinking and sound philosophic presentation of truth, they will be resurrected and published abroad, even to the reproach and confusion of our time.

Whether they shall be published speedily depends largely on the interest now to be manifested by Dr. Vaughan's old students, his friends and admirers generally, and all who are interested to forward true theological science. Let those who wish them published and who wish to have copies of them, write to Dr. Vaughan himself, at Roanoke, or to the writer of this notice. If the interest shall appear adequate, further and, we hope, sufficient measures, shall then be undertaken, Providence favoring, to insure their publication.

Digitized by Google

THE PULPIT AS SEEN FROM THE PEW.

By D. C. Arnold.

Man is mortal and doomed to die. There is a higher destiny than that of death.

There is a life to be. Whither I am going and how is a far more vital question for me than whence I came and how. My state in the life to be is conditioned on my life here. Hence the greatest problem of life for each of us is how to live this life.

Fortunate, indeed, is that youth who, in his early years, has learned how to live his daily life.

Doubly fortunate is that man, the closing years of whose life is the full fruition of a well-regulated life in the formative years of youth.

The first great lesson of life to learn is the responsibility of youth. Manhood is but the solution of the problem of boyhood; womanhood is but the solution of the problem of girlhood; and the being in the life to come is but the solution of the problem of the being of this life.

All the struggles, the conflicts, the defeats, and the victories of life are but the attempts to solve the problem, the unknown quantities of which are placed in youth. The boy is the prophecy of the man. Every boyhood holds a mortgage on every manhood. The boy is law-giver to the man.

It is the universal and unreserved judgment of mankind, that every youth, whether boy or girl, in the formative period of life, in the habits formed, in the choices made, in the methods of thought adopted, is a sort of legislative body, enacting laws that will inevitably govern in the maturer years. The hours of childhood trace the features of manhood, and sow the harvests of age.

Too often do we find age the subject of an absolute monarchy, because youth has been a tyrant; too often do we find age groaning under great burdens of life because youth has levied an exhorbitant tax; too often do we find the back of age scarred and bleeding because youth has been a hard task-master.

Then, I repeat, that the great lesson of life to be learned early, is the responsibilities of early life.

When we are not fit to live, we are certainly not fit to die;

Digitized by Google

when we are best prepared to die, we are certainly most fit to live. Therefore that fountain of wisdom which qualifies us for both living and dying and renders youth charitable to age, is the fountain at which we should daily drink. But youth is self-willed and prone to evil. It gropes in darkness and cannot find the fountain if it would, and oftimes it would not if it could. Then, who is the prophet, who is God's anointed to stand at the fountain and cry aloud, "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money come; come ye, buy, and eat: yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price." "Wherefore do you spend your money for that which is not bread? and your labor for that which satisfieth not? hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness."

"Incline your ear and come unto me; hear and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David."

Who is to speak forth the warning: "Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes; but know thou for all these things God will bring thee into judgment." Teaching that the day of judgment is to be thought on in the days of youth? Who is to admonish them to "remember now their Creator in the days of their youth, while the evil days come not, nor the years draw nigh, when they shall say, I have no pleasure in them."

Solomon said it is the preacher, and because he was wise, he still taught the people knowledge and sought to find out acceptable words, even words of truth.

With these reflections before us, it seems clear that the old should not be instructed less, but the young more—the young to start right that life may end right, the old to help them to get a good start.

With these reflections before us the responsibility of the clergy seems staggering. No wonder, with God's hand laid upon him, Paul exclaimed, "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel." No wonder the edict has gone forth, "Work while the day lasts, for the night cometh, when no man can work."

But how work wisely? The preacher must be wise and seek acceptable words. Pedagogical principles apply just as well to

Digitized by Google

the preacher as to the teacher, and so let us have them. A word is the sign of an "idea." A sentence is the expression of a thought. These are the preacher's instruments. If the idea for which the word stands as a sign is not suggested to your mind by the sign, the sentence expresses no thought to you.

A young lady once read in my presence: "Charles II. began his reign with amnesty to all." Amnesty was the word that rendered the sentence useless to her. Had the word "pardon" or "forgiveness" been used instead, the result would have been quite different.

A lawyer asked of a witness the following question: "What was the conversation that preceded the last remark?" The witness, though willing, was unable to answer. The lawyer changed the question to "What was the talk afore that?" Instantly the question was answered. The lawyer used "afore" instead of "before" because he had observed the witness using the former. He omitted the words "conversation," "preceded," and "remark," signs of ideas, but they suggested no ideas to him.

For the sons of toil who have had poor or no opportunities for scholarship, and for the butterflies of fashion who loll through the platitudes of fashionable life, the preacher must be wise and seek to find out acceptable words.

Let us study the subject for awhile under the psychologic principles which underlie all good preaching and good teaching:

(1) A percept is the product of a single perceptive act of a single sense, the object being present—that is, I see a lemon and perceive its color; I taste a lemon and perceive its flavor; I smell a lemon and perceive its odor; I feel a lemon and perceive its shape. Now, when these perceptive acts of these several senses are combined by synthesis into a psychical whole, the resulting product or image is a concept. Now, if I name orange, melon, donkey, moon, house, pineapple and banana, their concepts pass before your minds in panoramic view as rapidly as I can name them. But these are concrete concepts, the products of sense perception. Such concepts may be caused to be formed in the minds of others in one of three ways: (1) First and best, the object itself; (2) second best, a picture of the object; (3) last and least productive of good results, is a word-painting or description.

Now, I wish to name another list of things: Rigwiddie, sahib, sahibah, astragalus and platy-rhine. Did the concepts pass before

Digitized by Google

your mind this time as before? Just in the condition in which you find yourselves now, two-thirds of your audiences will find themselves on terms of much more common use.

But these terms may readily be made plain by a simple definition, because you have the concepts in your minds associated with other words that mean the same. When I tell you that rigwiddie is a Scotch term which means the back-band of harness which holds up the shafts; that sahib and sahibah are Persian terms meaning gentleman and lady; that astragalus is a scientific term designating the ankle-bone, and that platy-rhine means one of a group of monkeys having a round head and a flat nose, the concepts all appear.

But we have another list quite different in character and give the preacher his greatest trouble. They are as follows: Righteousness, peace, joy, love, gentleness, goodness, faith, etc. They are abstract terms. Their concepts are abstract. We can do nothing with them with any of the five senses. I have no object or picture to aid me. I cannot make a direct word-painting of a single one of them. They can only be thought of. Now it is, that old words must be put to new uses. Now it is, that these abstract terms, hard to understand and apply, must be talked about in the terms of concrete things already understood. The fixing of these abstract concepts in the minds of those to be taught draws on the greatest skill of both preacher and teacher. I have sat in an audience when such terms as atonement, sanctification, regeneration, incarnation, vicarious suffering, immaculate conception, carnal mindedness, lasciviousness, and concupiscence were hurled out over the audience to fall like rain-drops on the backs of ducks. In the pedagogical world, I know that ripeness of scholarship is measured by simplicity of expression, and pedantry covers an abundance of ignorance.

With these facts before us we plead for simplicity of both preaching and teaching.

I used to sit under the voice of a venerable bishop whom God has long since taken to himself. He came to us one evening after a journey of 2,000 miles and much loss of sleep. He arose in the pulpit and said he was weary, and if we would excuse him he would just talk to us on simple faith in God. He talked for thirty minutes enforcing every thought with the simplest illustrations. I am sure he could not have been heard by any one

Digitized by Google

outside of the church. He made all the noise that was made inside. We felt when he was through that he had led us closer to God than he had ever done before. I had often listened to his flights of oratory and drank at his fountain of wisdom; but when he was through that night I felt like saying, "Blessed are ye when ye are weary." Thirty years have passed away since the night of that simple expository talk on faith in God and the eloquent tongue has long since been silenced, but the effects of the talk abide with me yet. We were hungry and he fed us. But the lowly Nazarene is the greatest example of simple teaching. His skill as a teacher is marvelously shown by the manner in which, through parables, he caused the imagination to light the pathway to spiritual truth.

When he would explain the kingdom of heaven to his disciples, the leaven and the meal, the mustard seed, the treasure hid in a field, were called into service.

When he would explain the preaching of the Word and the sower and the seed enlightened the understanding.

When God's loving forgiveness was to be made plain, a wayward boy and an aged father served the purpose well.

When he would teach his father's tender care, the relationship of shepherd and sheep made it plain. In his preparation for such teaching as this, nothing in nature seems to have escaped his gaze; the clouds, the winds of heaven, the fields of waving grain, the thorns and grass, the lilies of the valley, gold, silver and precious stones, the birds of the air, the shepherd and the sheep, kings and laborers, the joys of domestic and social life, all from his lips some truth proclaim. He taught in clearness and simplicity; nothing so characterized his teachings as perspicuity. The ministry too often forgets that perspicuity is a relative quality; that what may seem very plain to one person may be very obscure to another of less scholarship; and, as a result, the preacher too often over-reaches his people and gives them but little information when he thinks he is giving them the most.

For conciseness and directness, nothing in the whole range of literature can be compared to the discourses of our Lord. Let us select, for example, the opening words of His first recorded sermon: "Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," and the following beatitudes. They are remarkable

Digitized by Google

for simplicity and purity of diction. There is a fitness in every word. No rhetorician has ever suggested a change by which a word or a syllable of them could be made more clear. No one finds the least difficulty in learning them as recorded, or ever thinks of expressing them in any other way. They may be directly translated into any other language without loss of energy. They have been translated into all languages and scattered to all peoples. And for those who wish to write pure English undefiled they are an unapproachable model. Note the closing words of the same sermon: "Every one therefore which heareth these words of mine, and doeth them, shall be likened unto a wise man which built his house upon a rock; and the rains descended and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock." Almost wholly Anglo-Saxon; the finest specimen of simple diction; the very acme of oratorical art, and yet so plain that the way-faring man, though a fool, may read and understand. But there is one thing that gave that sermon the vitality that has carried it over 2,000 years without diminishing its brilliancy or detracting from its interest. The record tells us that the preacher in the solitude of the mountain, in the stillness of the night, and until the gray dawn of the morning, sought his Father's blessing and guidance in the day that was before him; and then, from his seclusion in the mountain, with the incense of prayer all about him, he came before those who were to sit at his feet and learn wisdom; and in language so simple in diction, so pure in thought, so profound, and in sincerity so earnest, he talked as never man talked before. The great words of life that he uttered that day on the Horns of Hattan have flown down over the centuries and into the hearts of men like a benediction from the skies.

Now, let us leave this for a brief time and think along another line. "The prostitution of the pulpit." Left in a city a few years ago to spend the Sabbath, we decided to hear a Universalist minister, noted for his eloquence and profundity of knowledge, and was much surprised to hear him announce as his theme, "Why the Presbyterians revised their Confession of Faith." After an effort at the interpretation of some of the changes made, mingled with too much jesting for the sacredness of the pulpit, he closed by announcing that the Acts of the Assembly in this

Digitized by Google

matter had put us all on the Universalist platform, and that now we were all fit subjects for membership in his church. We left the church hungry for something we didn't get. So for the night service we decided to seek other pasture and got into the Congregational fold. The minister is a scholarly man and stands high in the councils of his church. He arose and announced as his theme "The Origin of Mountains." So we sat under a rehash of Physical Geography and Geology for thirty-five minutes, and were blessedly dismissed. The Sabbath day closed and not a scintilla of the story of the lowly Nazarene; not an iota of the Sweet Singer of Israel, who sang the sweet song of the soul, both of which for millenniums have illuminated the dark places of the earth and added brilliancy to the bright ones. And, in both instances the choir exploited itself in music instead of praise and adoration of God.

I was thankful that from the Sacred Psalms, brilliant by the friction of the fleeting centuries over them, I could enjoy what those choirs by their strenuous efforts could not give; and from the "Sermon on the Mount," hoary with age, I could get what the sermon, fresh from the lips of the preacher did not supply.

But the pulpit is being prostituted worse than that in higher places, where its uplift of humanity should be the greatest and its influence most profound. In one of the papers some months ago, I observed these Sunday advertisements: Catchy ones indeed—"Seeking grass for mules and finding Elijah"; "A great gulf fixed, one of a series of triumphant blast addresses"; "The Crack Detective"; "Out of the Frying Pan Into the Fire"; "A Study of a Recent Suicide"; "The Persistence of Hell." Each minister should have signed his Rev. John Blank, Sensationalism a Specialty. They have dragged their churches by their advertisements down to the level of the commonest of the common theatre. And I doubt not, if we had been present at the service, we would have observed levity to take the place of sobriety, sound to take the place of sense, applause to take the place of worship, and the preacher to take the place of Christ. The church cannot afford to stoop down to the world, she cannot adopt its methods, she cannot contend in the world's armor, and she must not forget that Christ is her hope, and that in him alone she has a claim to the promises of God.

Let the Word be preached in purity and power, and God will

Digitized by Google

see that His Word shall not return unto Him void, but it shall accomplish that which He pleases, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto He has sent it.

When Constantine was marching into Italy, it is said that he saw a flaming cross in the heavens with the inscription, "By this conquer." Let every church adopt the motto, and then wage war, and God will be in the heat of the battle and victory will be inevitable.

But I must hasten on to another line of thought. After the resurrection of Christ he issued the order to his disciples, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." We hear much of it, and it is right. But, "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God," and "Feed my sheep," are commands as obligatory and from the same source.

"Give ye them to eat," was the imperative, though compassionate, answer to the anxious inquiries of the disciples, and the five thousand were fed.

From Bethsaida's desert place, along the Gallilian shores, and down through Judian valleys, re-echoed from her mountain slopes, over continent and island, over sea and lake, over leafy solitude and populous cities, and down through the centuries to every God appointed preacher comes the same matchless words, "Give ye them to eat." Not stones for bread nor husks for grain, not a serpent for a fish, is the command; but that bread which will satisfy the millions of souls that are hungering and thirsting for a righteousness that will make them pure and honest.

Preachers ought to handle the standard themes of sin and penitence and the condition of God's pardon. Indeed, it is a necessity, for we are ignorant of the plan of salvation, and need instruction pure and simple. But, in doctrinal sermons and exposition of creeds we find ourselves less interested; they are but the products of the disagreements of men. They were all a unit in the prosecution of the reformation, and when the great victory was achieved they quarreled over the spoils. There is but one creed, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Christ said on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets, and that they are more than all burnt offerings and sacrifice, and said to the

Digitized by Google

lawyer, "This do and thou shalt live." No man can make it better by adding to it, and no man dare to take away from it. Observed as it should be God's name would be honored and reverenced everywhere. "Man's inhumanity to man" would cease and God's grace abound over the earth.

We need sermons of warning and admonition, lest in the swirl of the social and commercial world we forget God and lose sight of Him forever. There are days so rare in June, when the heavens try the earth if it be in tune; joy comes, grief goes, we know not how. Everything is happy now, coffers full, larders replete, wardrobes gorgeous, and life a roundelay of pleasure.

Now it is that we are in great danger. Breakers not far ahead, bathers in the surf of pleasure are nearing the life-line; others with their feet almost in the dreaded undertow of sin. Let the preacher cry aloud in tones of warning, "Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help and look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek the Lord!" Longfellow wrote, "The day is cold and dark and dreary. It rains and the wind is never weary; the vine still clings to the mouldering wall; but at every gust the dead leaves fall, and the day is dark and dreary." It is then that we draw our chair closer to the grate and poke the fire.

"My life is cold and dark and dreary; it rains and the wind is never weary; my thoughts still cling to the mouldering past, but the hopes of youth fall thick in the blast, and the days are dark and dreary."

At such a time we would draw close to God and long for the warmth of his love. Life is filled with sadness and bitter struggle from the cradle to the grave. It is no easy task to perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord; no easy task to bring the soul up from its low aims, to a heavenly standard; no easy task to crush its spiritual foes beneath its feet. We need all the encouragement that we can get, and look to our spiritual counsellors for it. Then there are those who walk on the Alpine paths of life against driving misery and through stormy sorrows and over sharp afflictions. They walk with bared feet and naked breasts, jaded, mangled and chilled. Their life is a hand-to-hand fight for crusts, rags and shelter from the storm. They grow thin and frail and gray before their time in toil and weary strivings for existence. "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God." In the midst of such impenetrable gloom, great

Digitized by Google

inspiration and encouragement may be drawn from such themes as "There shall be light in the evening time," "Let not your heart be troubled, I go to prepare a place for you," "Weeping may endure through the night time, but joy cometh in the morning," and "The Lord turned the captivity of Job."

Preach words of cheer, preach passionate love of truth, fearless devotion to principle, sweetness and purity in human relationship; preach that love is universal and has kindled the embers of brotherhood into a quenchless flame, and in its sweet warmth heaven plays about every heart, glows in every pathway, and illumines every home.

"Feed my sheep," "Give ye them to eat," and then will come the preacher's greatest reward, in the same voice responding, "I was hungry and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty and ye gave me drink; for as ye did it to the least of these, ye did it unto me."

Digitized by Google

THE YEARS THAT THE LOCUST HATH EATEN.

By Rev. Russell Cecil, D. D.

"And I will restore to you the years that the locust hath eaten."—Joel ii. 25.

The prophet Joel, in the first part of his book, describes the coming of a plague of locusts upon the land of Israel. The scourge seems to have appeared in his day. It was like an invading army which destroyed everything before it. "The land," he says, "is as the Garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness." (Ch. ii. 3.) "The field is wasted, the land mourneth," (i. 10) "the vine is dried up, the fig tree languisheth," "because joy is withered away from the sons of men." (i. 12.) The ruin is so great that even "the meat offering and the drink offering is cut off from the house of God." (i. 8, 13.)

This plague was no doubt a real occurrence, and yet it had a symbolical significance. It was not an accident or a simple event in the course of nature any more than the plagues of Egypt in the days of Moses and Pharaoh were accidents or simple natural events. It was designed in the Providence of God as an affliction upon the land for some wise purpose, and that purpose had in it, as the purpose of God always does, the rebuke of sin and the encouragement of righteousness. The plagues in Egypt were a punishment to Pharaoh and his people, but they were a blessing to the children of God, so the great scourge of locusts which Joel describes in such graphic language, while a chastisement for the land, had in it also a blessing. It was intended to bring the people nearer to God.

It was also emblematic to Israel of scourges that would come upon their land in the future, and did come by invading armies, all of which were permitted by Jehovah on account of their unbelief and sin, and which were overruled for their good. The course of Providence in one instance was the same in all—the scourges were all typical of the last Day.

After the description of the plague of locusts the prophet calls the people to repentance. "Therefore also now," saith the Lord, "turn ye even to me with all your heart, and with fasting, and with weeping, and with mourning; and rend your heart, and not your garments, and turn unto the Lord your God; for he is

Digitized by Google

gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repenteth him of the evil." (ii. 12, 13.) He urges them to proclaim "a fast," to "call a solemn assembly," and let "the priests and ministers of the Lord weep between the porch and the altar," and pray to God to spare his people and let not the heathen rule over them.

Then he says the Lord will "pity his people," and answer graciously; he will remove the scourge and send them abundant harvests to satisfy their need. Among other promises we have that of the text, "And I will restore to you the years that the locusts hath eaten." "And ye shall eat in plenty, and be satisfied, and praise the name of the Lord your God, that hath dealt wondrously with you; and my people shall never be ashamed." (ii. 25, 26.) Then follows that famous passage in which the prophet describes a great outpouring of the spirit—the passage which Peter quotes at length in his sermon on the Day of Pentecost, and which he says was fulfilled in the events of that day. There is a precious promise in the text: "And I will restore to you the years that the locust hath eaten." Let us consider it to-day for our spiritual profit.

1. This promise is for those who feel that in one way or another some part of life for them has been lost. Most people who have lived to mature age, in surveying the past candidly, are convinced that some years of their life have been comparatively fruitless, perhaps even sinfully wasted.

This is the outcome of a life of ungodliness. However enjoyable the pleasures of sin may be as one is passing through such experiences, the years thus spent do not look well when one reaches the serious thought of mature age and reflects upon them. Robert Burns, after many years of dissipation and folly, once said: "My e'en look back upon a prospect drear."

When Jacob was presented to Pharaoh by his son Joseph, the king, impressed with the patriarch's venerable appearance, asked, "How old art thou?" The question was simple enough, but Jacob's reply was pathetic: "The days of the years of my pilgrimage are an hundred and thirty years: few and evil have the days of the years of my life been, and have not attained unto the days of the years of the life of my fathers in the days of their pilgrimage." (Gen. xlvii. 8-9.) There were many dark places in Jacob's memory as it traversed the century and more of years

Digitized by Google

behind him. He could not fail to recall the deceit and treachery of his youth which made him an exile from his father's house, and made his only brother a life-long enemy, and which had indeed stained so much of the pathway over which he had travelled. Many others, who, like him have chosen a crooked course, have had similar experiences. Years of dissipation, of dishonesty, of impurity, or of worldliness and folly are not a cherished recollection to the man or the woman whose hair is silvered with age, whose mental and physical powers are gradually but certainly weakening, and whose path in the not distant future inevitably leads through the valley and the shadow of death. Then it is that the years of irreligion, ungodliness and unfaithfulness in duty, of selfishness, pride, hardness of heart, and impenitence in sin; of rejection of Christ and his service begin to look like "years that the locust hath eaten," and one can not reflect upon them with emotions of pleasure. They seem to have been lost irretrievably, and one wishes they had never been.

Sometimes, also, one's life has in it a large percentage of years of apparent failure. This may be the case even with the Child of God. I suppose that Moses, as the years multiplied upon his head to the great number of four score, before the day that God called to him out of the burning bush in the Mountain of Midian, must have regarded his life as virtually a failure. He had started upon his career with brilliant prospects, but one rash act had dashed all those prospects to the ground, and he who had been reared in a king's court, "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," and "mighty in word and deed," and whose heart had burned with the high and holy ambition to do a great work for God in the deliverance of his people from slavery, had fled for his life and spent forty precious years in exile feeding the flock of his father-in-law in the wilderness. Surely he might have thought the locust has eaten those years up, and they are gone, and such a thought could have been only fruitful of pain and regret. Nor was this a singular experience of Moses. The past in the lives of many before me is full of failures and disappointments. Few, if any, of you have attained to your ideals. You have tried this and you have tried that, sometimes rashly, sometimes timidly, sometimes with high hope and courage, sometimes with the energy of despair, but success has been ever eluding your grasp, and the ideal is still an unrealized fancy. It

Digitized by Google

has been so in material things and also in spiritual. Many a faithful and earnest Christian feels that his spiritual life has been a failure. It appears so barren and unproductive, and so far short of what it might have been that he cannot regard it with satisfaction. Lord Kelvin, one of the most celebrated scientists of this age, and an humble Christian, in answer to the congratulations of his friends on the fiftieth anniversary of his professorship in the University of Glasgow, said that his principal regret was that he had accomplished so little and had fallen so far short of what he had hoped to do in life. And that is the feeling of all earnest, faithful hearts as they contemplate their service for the Master.

The lives of others are ravaged by affliction. Like Paul, they have "sorrow upon sorrow." Sometimes a great block of years is eaten up by personal ill health, or the ill health of some loved one who demands constant care. Job passed through a whole avalanche of troubles, as calamity after calamity came crashing down upon him. His life was full of tragedy, and that has been true of many others besides him. Perhaps there are some here who, when they think of their own experience, feel like saying, as the prophet Joel did about the scourges of Israel, "That which the palmer-worm hath left hath the locust eaten; and that which the locust hath left hath the canker-worm eaten; and that which the canker-worm hath left hath the caterpillar eaten." (i. 4.) And all is wasteness and desolation. But, however painful may have been your experiences, and whether it has been sin or failure, or sorrow, or all of these combined which has eaten up so many years of your past, the gracious promise of the text is just as much for you as it was for ancient Israel.

2. Observe that the promise is for restoration. "And I will restore to you," saith God, "the years that the locust hath eaten, the canker-worm, and the caterpillar, and the palmer-worm, my great army which I sent among you."

This promise reveals the infinite goodness and love of God. It could not have arisen from any other source. It is of a piece with his purpose through which the scourge was permitted to come upon the land. That did not indicate that God had forgotten them or that in anger he had turned away from them. It was only a practical illustration of the spiritual truth, that "whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son

Digitized by Google

whom he receiveth." It means that if God in his love finds it necessary to wound his people he is always ready to heal their wounds; if he finds it necessary to punish the guilty, he is always ready to forgive the penitent.

The conditions on which this promise is to be fulfilled are just the same with us as they were with Israel, for whom Joel was especially writing. He called the people to repentance and to prayer. If they would "turn unto the Lord with fasting and with weeping," and "would rend their hearts and not their garments," then they would find that "he was gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness," and if "the priests and ministers of the Lord" would pray, "Spare thy people, O Lord, and give not thine heritage to reproach that the heathen should rule over them," "then," the prophet assures them, "will the Lord be jealous for his land and pity his people," then will he answer them in peace and bless them, and "restore unto them the years that the locust hath eaten."

This is one method of approaching God that never fails. Many have called upon him in anger, or in the pride and vanity of a wicked heart, or in rebellious grief, and the heavens have been as brass to their petitions, but no broken-hearted penitent, no anguish-stricken spirit humbled by failure and disappointment, and no soul burdened with sorrow ever turns to him for relief in vain. "Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven." "Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted." When we discover the wretchedness, the uselessness, the aimlessness, the sinfulness of the godless life, and when we come to him in all humility and penitence and conscious weakness, then we are sure to find him, for then he is waiting for us, and waiting to be gracious. Then he stands ready to make good the losses which we have incurred by sin out of the riches of his grace. For Paul assures us that "where sin abounded grace did much more abound." He is abundantly able and abundantly willing to repair the waste places in any life which has been scourged by the locusts and canker-worms of unbelief and sin and sorrow.

3. Much is involved in this promise of restoration. There is forgiveness for the sins and failures of the past. "Let the wicked forsake his ways and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon

Digitized by Google

him, and, to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." Sin is wiped out in forgiveness; it is remembered against the transgressor no more forever. When it has been forgiven, it does not rise up again, like Banquo's ghost, to torment the sinner. It may be remembered by him, but it has been blotted out of God's eternal book of accounts, and there is an end of it. When a criminal has received executive pardon, the law can never bring another action against him for that crime. It may, and will, remain a dark spot in his own life and memory, but he is as free before the law as if he had never transgressed. This is true also of the pardoned sinner in the sight of God.

God restores by grace, as I have said, what has been lost by sin. The losses in Eden were made good on Calvary. When the work of grace in the redemption of the saved sinner is complete, and he awakes in glory, it will not be in the likeness of Adam, but in the likeness of the Lord Jesus Christ. The psalmist says in his prayer, "I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." We would not be satisfied, neither would the Saviour, if, as the result of his redeeming work, we were only restored to the image of the unfallen Adam. He shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied, and we also shall be satisfied, when we shall be like him, and shall see him as he is. "Paradise Regained" is better than "Paradise Lost." The redemption life is to be grander, fuller, and more glorious than the innocent life in the garden of Eden.

This restoration involves the mastery of many hitherto unlearned lessons, and much needed discipline of character. Think of the effect of forty years wandering in Midian upon Moses! He overcame the rashness of youth and learned self-control. By years of quiet mediation and prayer he learned to wait till the mind of God was revealed to him and not to run before the Almighty. His body accustomed to luxury, became inured to hardship and exposure. He became acquainted with the mountains of Nebo and with the adjacent countries lying between Egypt and Palestine, through which the people of Israel would necessarily pass in their journey. He also heard the voice of God in the burning bush, and, altogether, he was better prepared at the end of that long and painful experience for his great task than he was at the beginning of it. Think, too, of the effect of his manifold afflictions upon Job! That experience was a crucial

Digitized by Google

test of his faith in God and of the integrity of his character. He was so humbled before God that he came to the point of saying, "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes." (Job xlii. 5, 6.) Then the Lord literally restored to him the years that the locusts had eaten, for the record says, "So the Lord blessed the latter end of Job more than the beginning." His possessions were double what they were before his afflictions, and another family of seven sons and three daughters were given to him. It is in such incomprehensible experiences as these of Moses and Job that men learn the most valuable lessons of life and their characters receive that discipline which is essential to their proper development.

This restoration promised in the text involves also the blessing of the Holy Spirit. There is nothing more instructive and interesting in this remarkable passage than the verses immediately following the text. "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh," and then follows the passage made use of by Peter on the Day of Pentecost. How strange the connection of these words with the text, and yet how suggestive of important spiritual truth! "Afterward," that is, after the repentance and the prayers and the blessing of God in restoring the years which had been lost in the plague, then came the outpouring of the Spirit. Is that not the recognized order of God's procedure in grace? The Spirit comes after Gethsemane and Calvary; after the humiliation of the disciples by apparent failure and defeat; but also after ten days spent in supplication and prayer. So he comes to us not in seasons of sinful gayety and folly, not when every carnal desire of the heart is gratified, not when we are strangers to all anguish of soul, but when the heart has been broken for sin and the spirit by sorrow, when we have found the crucified Saviour to be the propiation for our sins and in him our souls are satisfied. "Afterward," the Spirit is poured out upon us in great abundance and we begin to "dream dreams" and to "see visions." If to-day, my friends, any of you look back upon some years which the locusts have eaten out of your life, and if you have learned the lessons which those bitter experiences were designed to teach, I am sure those years may be, if they have not already been, restored to you by the riches of God's saving and comforting grace and by the blessing of the Holy Spirit in your heart and life.

Digitized by Google

THE ELDERSHIP AND DIACONATE ON MISSION FIELDS.

By Missionaries on the Field.

AFRICA.

We have no data as to the organization of any of the Protestant churches in Africa, except the Southern Presbyterian Church in the Congo Free State. There the missionaries are following the apostolic injunction to "lay hands hastily on no man." As yet there are no members of the church who, according to the opinion of the missionaries, are sufficiently advanced in Christian experience and knowledge to hold offices in the church. But the missionaries have under their special care and training those whom they hope in the future to see made elders and deacons.—Ed.

BRAZIL.

If one would see the advantages of our Presbyterial form of government above all others that are in practice in Christendom he should observe the Christian Church in the mission fields.

I believe that if any body of believers, newly converted, were given a copy of the Scriptures and told to organize themselves into a church they would invariably elect for their government a plurality of elders and a board of deacons. In fact, I do not see how they could do otherwise if they wished the Divine order and sanction.

In Brazil, where the writer has labored for thirteen years, the office of elder has the place assigned to it in the New Testament. In the first place, it is an office desired by the believers and desired as a good work. In general, those elected to this high office appreciate the honor and feel their responsibility before God and magnify in all things their office. They, in fact, take it as seriously as young preachers take their solemn ordination vows. They feel that they are as especially set aside for their ministry as our candidates are to the Gospel ministery here in the United States. Of course, this belief and this manner of regarding their office produces a powerful effect on the exercising of its functions. As so many of the churches have no regular minister, this fact is providentially of great value to the work. In the absence of a regular pastor the elders take upon themselves the instruction of the congregation in word and doctrine. Many of them develope into good preachers and the people give to them

Digitized by Google

that honor and receive the preached Word with as much obedience as if the hands of Presbytery had been laid upon them.

Many of them also pass later on into the regular ministry. One church that I know now has three of its former elders in the ministry, and one other is a candidate, and this in the short space of six years.

The conclusion of all this is that the prosperity, as well as the continuance of the mission churches, depend on their eldership; and that where the office is considered by elders and people as it was instituted and practiced in the New Testament, there the best results are found.

What we may say of the eldership is true also of the Diaconate in Brazil, counting for the difference in the nature of the office. The two offices are the life of our churches.

GEO. E. HENDERLITE.

CHINA.

The Chinese are prepared for the office of ruling elder to some extent by the existence of the village elders throughout the country. In the rural districts, aside from the officials who depend on imperial appointment, there is a class of democratic officers next to the people, and generally elected by them, though sometimes they are appointed by the magistrates. They are called village elders, and every little village or community of people has one or more of them. As the name implies, they are elderly, responsible, respectable, representative men. They stand between the people and the officials, and they have authority in merely local affairs. When the Presbyterian Church proposed to govern its members by means of elders the title and the nature of the office were familiar to the people, and we cannot but believe that as everywhere else, only more especially, it is the best form of government for the Chinese. In the early history of the mission work of our church in China, before the ordination of elders, all the authority and discipline was in the hands of the missionaries, and it was not possible to avoid mistakes in the reception of members and in other acts of discipline. The foreigner can never thoroughly understand the mind of a Chinaman, who "for ways that are dark and tricks that are vain is peculiar." After the establishment of the eldership the practice of discipline was much more thorough, correct and efficient. The

Digitized by Google

native elders understood the native mind, and the habits, customs, regulations and proprieties of the people, and so had better understanding of when, where and how to exercise discipline than any foreign missionary had.

As a rule, the Lord's supper is administered once in two months, and it is the rule for applicants for baptism to appear before the session on a day previous to its celebration. The missionary, acting as pastor, moderates the session, which is constituted in the ordinary way. The applicants appear, either singly or in a group. Their names, ages, occupations, abodes, etc., are taken down by the clerk of Session. Then each one of the elders is requested to examine them, and they do this in a most thorough manner, first asking them questions on the doctrines of salvation, then as to their motives in applying for baptism, and then as to the conformity of their conduct to Christian standards of living. It is very common for a person who seems to understand the plan of salvation very thoroughly, and to be trusting in the atonement of Christ alone for salvation, when asked as to the significance of baptism to reply that it is necessary for salvation. This arises from the importance which is given to mere outward forms in their heathen religions. As a rule, about half an hour is generally occupied in the examination of each applicant, and great stress is laid on the daily conduct in the home and in business. After the examination, the applicants retire and the elders discuss each case before the vote is taken. Then they are recalled and the decision is announced. Those who are received are admonished to be more circumspect after they have publicly taken the name of Christian, and those who are refused are instructed in the points where they were lacking and admonished to correct faults, errors, etc., and apply again at the next communion.

It is almost an unwritten rule that no one is to be admitted on the first application. In one case, a man had applied six times, embracing a period of at least a year, and was still not accepted. He felt discouraged, and complained to one of the native helpers, saying that the session was too strict, and he would never apply again, because there was no Scriptural authority for such treatment. The helper replied, "May be there is authority. How often have you applied?" "Six times." "Well, do you remember the case of Naaman, who was told to wash seven times?

Digitized by Google

You have only tried six times; now try again." "Well, I will." He did so, was admitted to baptism, became an earnest member and was made a deacon.

In cases of discipline the native elders exercise their office with tenderness, discretion and fidelity, whether it be by private or public admonition, by temporary suspension from church privileges or excommunication. They lead in public prayer, and in the absence of the pastor, conduct the services of the church, and sometimes perform the ceremonies of funerals or marriages.

As to the office of deacon, it will be sufficient to quote the remark of one of the wise Chinese Christians when the question of qualifications for deacons was under consideration. He said: "It is much more important to have a good man for a deacon than for an elder, because he handles the money." It is my observation that the deacons are always the most substantial and reliable men, financially. The Chinese are noted for being good business men, and they naturally carry this quality into the management of the business of the church, and that branch of work has been carried on quite satisfactorily.

For a closing word it gives me great pleasure to say that the missionaries have every reason for thankfulness for the great assistance the native officers in the Chinese church give us. It is wonderful to see how people just emerging from heathenism can manage the spiritual and the secular affairs of the church so wisely, so faithfully and so efficiently. JOHN L. STUART.

INDIA.

The Presbyterian churches in India have been organized upon the plan of the various Presbyterian churches in Britain and America. Recently, ten of these various Presbyterian denominations have been united into one Presbyterian church in India. The churches still separated are the American United Presbyterian Church, the Welch Presbyterian Church and the American Reformed Presbyterian. In all these churches the eldership is two fold—viz., the preaching elders or ministers and the ruling elders. The character of these elders varies with their education and experience in church work. Some of them are very active—others do duty under direction of the pastor as they are able.

The church in India has lost two of its most distinguished elders during the past six months—Rai Maya Dáss, and Mr. Manaise Wylie. Both were prominent in the church courts and

Digitized by Google

most active in their official life. In India the laity generally are ready to undertake any work their pastors suggest. The eldership represent the laity in this respect, and many are engaged in voluntary service of an evangelistic character. This feature of the official life of the churches is one of the most encouraging signs of the growth and increasing power of the Presbyterian churches in India.

As to the office of deacon, we do not always feel the need of his service, because the congregations are so small that the elders are usually able to perform the duties of the diaconate. In the larger churches the deacons perform the duties usually incumbent upon the office in all American Presbyterian churches, but usually are responsible for the work of a board of trustees. Our Indian Church regards this duty as belonging to the diaconate. The difficulty of finding men endowed with the necessary business capacity often makes it impossible to constitute a board of deacons in addition to the eldership. Without doubt the regular order provided in our constitution for both elders and deacons will be established. E. M. WHERRY.

JAPAN.

To begin with, there is no Presbyterian Church in Japan except a single congregation at Tokyo. That is to say, there is no church which *calls* itself Presbyterian. The church which has grown up in connection with the various Presbyterian missions has from the beginning, declined to adopt that church name, but has always had something as colorless as its present name—"Nihon Kirisuto Kyokwai," or Church of Christ in Japan. This it has done, not from any antipathy to Presbyterian truth, but for irenic reasons. Its organization is entirely Presbyterian, but every name was refused except simply the name of Christ. For the same reason its written creed is simply evangelical, though the great likelihood is that its preachers are largely Calvinistic, trained as they are almost entirely in the schools established by the missions. But as such detailed questions concerning church government and doctrine have never yet arisen in this land, the Japanese brethren preferred not to commit their church beforehand, till the need should arise; at the same time, as individuals, they were perfectly willing to accept Calvinistic truth as far as convinced, and their churches, to organize on Presbyterian lines. Hence their written Form of Government is fully Presbyterian, all but the title page.

Digitized by Google

Another consequence, too, and which brings us to our subject, is that there are plenty of elders and deacons in this land, and they are very much like their prototypes in America. One thing, however, which would attract notice at once is that the church here has not only these officers, but has added the *deaconess.* The explanation for her is (where any explanation is offered) that the apostle, in 1 Tim. iii., is explaining the correct situation in "the church of the living God" (vs. 15), and that the previous verses describe the *officers;* consequently in verse 11, the correct translation is not "wives," as the Authorized has it, nor "women," as the Revisers put it, but "women *deacons,*" supplying the second word from the context of verse 8. Whether this exegesis is acceptable or not, many churches have the "women deacons." They are chosen and ordained just like their brother officers; they pass the collection-bag on the women's side of the congregation (the sexes sit separately here); they visit the sick and the poor, and in this department they are far more efficient than the men. Altogether, this seems an excellent arrangement.

Concerning the eldership, also, there is a point well worth noting; the time-honored and hoary distinction between "the teaching elder" and "the ruling elder" has never seemed to bother folks much over here. If they are the same rank, then they *are* the same rank, and the consequences are fully accepted. If, then, an elder has the time and the ability to preach with acceptance to the people, then he *preaches,* and no church court ever does such a thing as to give him *permission* to "exhort, or to read a sermon from some approved divine." If he can preach, he is encouraged to do so, and that without the least idea that there is anything irregular in such a thing. Often the elders take each his regular turn with the pastor in conducting the weekly prayer-meeting; sometimes they do the same in presiding at the Sabbath morning services, leaving, however, the sermon mostly to the pastor.

In another respect, the Japanese Church has put into practice a theory often heard at home—viz., that in all church courts, only those should have the right to vote who *represent* something. This includes all elders sent to represent their churches, active pastors, professors in theological schools approved by the court, also evangelists in work to which the court (Presbyterian) has appointed them.

But it *excludes* all ordained ministers who do not fall under

Digitized by Google

any of the above categories, from any right to vote, though in all other respects they have full rights as presbyters.

In pastoral work as well, whenever elders have the time or talent for it, they are encouraged to do all of this work they can. An interesting instance of this was an elder who was formerly a captain in this (Nagoya) garrison. Often he used to ride round on horseback to the homes of the Christians to remind them of the midweek prayer-meeting, or any service they were likely to forget. As nobody but officials or wealthy folks ride horseback in this land, and as the army is the very *elite* of the revered, this action of our elder was a most valuable aid in getting people out to meetings. R. E. McALPINE.

KOREA.

There are four Presbyterian missions at work in Korea—viz., the Northern Presbyterian, the Southern Presbyterian (of the United States), the Canadian and the Australian missions. These four missions, for the organization of but one native Presbyterian Church in Korea, organized themselves into a "Council of Presbyterian Missions." Each mission handed over its (indirect) ecclesiastical authority to this council, which corresponds to synod. The council is composed of a number of "Presbyterial committees," which represent very imperfectly the Presbytery. The individual missionary or "Sessional Committee," brings request to the Presbyterial Committee for permission to proceed toward the election of an elder in a certain church (group), and to proceed toward the ordination, should the election fall on a certain man or men. After his election by the congregation he is given a course of study prescribed by the council on our Church Standards and the eldership. He is given a thorough examination on this course, and if satisfactory he is ordained by the missionary in charge, where practicable, assisted by other members of the Sessional Committee. At the examination of our Kunsan elder he quoted accurately practically all the passages in the New Testament bearing on the eldership.

As for the qualifications and efficiency of the Korean elder, he is about as well qualified and as efficient as the elder at home, considering his advantages and opportunities.

There are as yet only twenty-two ordained elders (Presbyterian) in Korea. A native Presbytery is to be organized in the fall of 1907. W. F. BULL.

Digitized by Google

UNION SEMINARY MAGAZINE.

EDITORIAL STAFF.

DAVID HOPKINS ROLSTON, *Editor.*

ALFRED S. ANDERSON, *Associate Editor.*
S. MC. P. GLASGOW, *Associate Editor.*
GASTON BOYLE, *Missionary Editor.*
LYLE MOORE MOFFETT, *Associate Missionary Editor*

PROF. W. W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D., *Review Editor.*
PROF. T. C. JOHNSTON, D. D., LL. D., *Review Editor.*
THOMAS W. HOOPER, JR., *Book Editor.*
HUGH H. HUDSON, *Business Manager.*

Published bi-monthly during the Seminary session by the students of Union Theological Seminary, in Virginia.

Change of address, discontinuance, or failure to receive the Magazine regularly should be reported promptly by mail to the Business Manager.

Terms: One dollar a year, in advance; single copy, twenty-five cents.

Editorial.

In this issue we present some able papers on the eldership and the diaconate which we trust will prove profitable to all who read them.

After the course of careful instruction given us here in Union Seminary, and proving all things by the Word of God, we are convinced that our church is organized along the lines laid down in the Scripture. We believe that our polity is that of the New Testament and the Apostolic Church. It follows, then, that we have the very best machinery possible for carrying on the work that is committed to the Church of Christ on Earth. No exigencies can arise, no conditions come to pass that were not foreseen from the first by the wise and gracious Spirit who inspired the writings of the Apostles and guided them in setting up the church of the new dispensation. The Christian religion being for the whole human race in all time only the mind of God could give the plan of organization that would always meet the demands of the times and circumstances in which the Church should exist. But we may be certain that if we follow the God-given plan, there can never an exigency arise that the Church

Digitized by Google

has not the adequate means of meeting successfully. All failures are due to a failure to follow out the plan that God has given. A machine may be ever so nicely adjusted for a certain end, and all the requisite mechanical parts be present, but nothing will be accomplished by it unless it runs.

Therefore, run!

But we do not like the simile of a machine. The Scripture illustration is better—that of the human body, a living organism comprising many parts dissimilar in form and varied in function, but all pulsing with the same life, moving toward the same end, and obeying the same head.

It is a universal law of nature in living organisms, that inactivity brings weakness, uselessness, and finally death. And the converse of this has passed into a proverb, "Practice makes perfect." Exercise develops strength and skill. If the organs of the body of Christ on earth are to be strong and useful, it is to be attained through exercise of the functions given them to perform. Certainly we would not go far astray when we say that the elders and the deacons (and under the term elder we include the preacher, too) are the more prominent organs of the body. Not the most important, for all have their work to perform, and none may look down upon the other, but the most prominent in that they are the representatives of the body in many important spheres of her activity. Then it would seem that it becomes them to study well the Word of God to see what their work is and be wise to redeem the time, or "buy up opportunity" for exercise.

No one officer has the right to take to himself the duties of the others, but if he attends to his own he has plenty to do. It is doubtless often easier for the pastor to do certain things that elders and deacons and laymen ought to do, than it is to get them to do it. But he has no right to burden himself with their duties and let them atrophy. It is not treating them right. That would indeed be a bad father who would not teach his son to do anything because he could do the thing with less effort and in a more satisfactory manner. The object in tasks that arise in the church may be regarded as two-fold. First that the end aimed at be accomplished, and, second, that some one be the better fitted for doing the like next time the occasion arises. The chariot wheels may indeed drive heavily at first, but by and by a company of trained workers will carry the work far beyond any thing that is lost in the training.

Digitized by Google

Should not every pastor heed the exhortation, "Do the work of an evangelist"? Has he any right to confine his labors entirely to his own charge's pulpit and the homes of his members? We suppose that within easy reach of every church there is some outlying neighborhood where the Gospel is not often preached that should be broken up and the seed sowed on it. The farmer sometimes leaves off plowing the corn in order to cut up the sprouts and briars that grow around the borders of his fields. If he does not do this they will press in upon him, and his arable land will get less and less every year.

Every Church of Christ ought to feel something of the Lord's compassion for the multitudes that are scattered as sheep having no shepherd. And if they have a good pastory they ought to want him to go to these outlying regions sometimes and preach the Gospel there. Suppose the pastors of our large churches were to give one Lord's day each month to this work, and one week out of each month to pastoral work in these regions. It would in the course of a year be three months of home mission work. Oh, but what in the world would become of the home church while this was going on? Our church has provided for it. A church need not die when the preacher is absent. Let the people assemble themselves as usual at the time for public worship. Let an elder lead the worship. A sermon may be read at the proper place. Or the elder may exhort the church in his own honest and homely way. Or, why may not all bring their Bibles, and while the congregation with open Bibles follow the reading, let the elder read the Word of God during the time usually given to the sermon? Thus they would get over large tracts of Scripture, and God would be speaking to their souls, and perhaps many who do not read their Bibles much would be greatly blessed thereby. Prayers could be offered for the absent pastor and for God's blessing on his labors in the place to which he is gone. The interest of the people would be quickened in local home missions, and the masses would be reached by simply reaching them. If there are those sick in the congregation during the pastor's absence we have officers whose very business it is to visit them and comfort them and pray with them.

This would throw the force of the best men in the ministry, the strongest and ablest ministers, and the most experienced pastors into the local home-mission work. And instead of the

Digitized by Google

policy of putting a home missionary in the near-by regions to work as a feeder of the large city church, whither the people will come as fast as they can leave the country for the city, or leave the poorer for the more wealthy districts, these home missionaries can be sent on to new fields on the frontier, to strategic centers out of reach of the home churches, and the work of the church thus be carried forward in a more energetic and determined manner.

But we had better stop now. The callow youth is ever ready to give advice to his seniors. The proof of theory is in practice. However, we would insert this saving clause, we have heard these things mentioned in even more forcible terms than we have presented them, by those who are older and more mature in judgment than we are. In short, these things are taught in Union Seminary. D. H. R.

At a regular meeting of the Union Seminary Magazine Association, held February 5th, the following gentlemen were elected as the staff for the ensuing year:

Editor—R. A. Lapsley, Jr.

Associate Editors—Flournoy Shepperson, S. H. McBride.

Missionary Editor—L. M. Moffett.

Associate Missionary Editor—J. M. McChesney.

Book Editor—J. W. Hethorn.

Review Editors—Rev. W. W. Moore, D. D., Rev. T. R. English, D. D.

Business Manager—J. H. Clarke.

Digitized by Google

Books.

REVIEW STAFF.

PROF. JOHN I. ARMSTRONG, Kirkwood, Ga.

REV. EGBERT W. SMITH, D. D., Greensboro, N. C.

REV. A. A. MCGEACHY, Sherman, Texas.

REV. HARRIS E. KIRK, D. D., Baltimore, Md.

PROF. THOS. C. JOHNSON, D. D., LL. D., Richmond, Va.

PROF. C. C. HERSMAN, D. D., LL. D., Richmond, Va.

PROF. W. W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D., Richmond, Va.

REV. D. P. MCGEACHY, Lenoir, N. C.

REV. WALTER L. LINGLE, Rock Hill, S. C.

REV. RUSSELL CECIL, D. D., Richmond, Va.

REV. R. E. VINSON, D, D. Austin, Texas.

REV. T. M. LOWRY, D. D., Knoxville, Tenn.

REV. THERON H. RICE, D. D., Atlanta, Ga.

PROF. G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D., Richmond, Va.

PROF. THOS. R. ENGLISH, D. D., Richmond, Va.

PROF. J. G. MCALLISTER, D. D., Hampdan-Sidney, Va.

Any book noticed in these pages may be had at publishers' prices through the Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va.

REVIEWS.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IN JAPAN. A Course of Lectures. *By William M. Imbrie, D. D.* Pp. 122. Price 75cts. net. Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work. Philadelphia, Pa.

This is a neat little volume, containing four lectures. We are not informed where these lectures were delivered. Supposing that they were delivered before popular congregations, it may be safely assumed that they were received with a sense of no little profit and pleasure. In the first lecture we have a sketch of the Japanese country, people, customs and civilization. In the second lecture the history of the Church of Christ in Japan is instructively sketched; in the third we have an equally good presentation and discussion of the methods of work employed by the missionaries laboring in the Empire. In the last, we have a portrayal of some of the more notable events in the history of this Church. This is a very interesting and suggestive chapter. The book seems worth the money. THOMAS C. JOHNSON.

Digitized by Google

THERE IS A RIVER. A POPULAR AND ILLUSTRATED REPORT OF THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY FOR THE YEAR 1905-'6. Pp. 111. *The Bible House,* 146 Queen Victoria Street, London, E. C., 1906.

The British and Foreign Bible Society began its course in 1804. It has done a great and highly beneficent work. It has been the fruitful partner of missions in the home-land and in almost every great foreign mission field whence the cry has gone up to it for copies of the Word of God in the vernacular of the people. The volume before us is a popular report, readable and instructive, as to life of the Society for the year 1905-1906. During this period, the Society issued over 5,977,000 copies of the Scriptures—complete or in parts. "The Society's list of versions now includes the names of four hundred distinct forms of speech. This means the complete Bible in 102 different languages; the New Testament in 94 more languages; and at least one Book of Scripture in 204 other languages." Eleven new names have been added to the list during the past year.

The wide reading of this report should be followed by a more liberal support of the Society.

STUDIES ON THE BOOK OF GENESIS. *By H. B. Pratt,* Spanish Translator of "Seymour's Evenings With the Romanists" (Noches Con Los Romanistas"), and author of "The Modern Version" of the Bible in Spanish, and also of "Estudios Sobre el Libro del Genesis," and of "Estudios Sobre el Dibro del Exodo." Translated from the Spanish. Sold by the American Tract Society, 150 Nassau Street, New York, Boston, Chicago.

The author of this work was, for many years, an honored missionary of the Southern Presbyterian Church. For more than half a century a diligent student of Scripture, and having an accurate knowledge of the Spanish language, he was employed by the American Bible Society to prepare a new Spanish version of the Scriptures. Having finished this work, he determined to spend the remainder of his days in the preparation of a Spanish commentary on the Bible, and in pursuance of this plan, he has already published commentaries on Genesis and Exodus.

The present work is a translation of the volume on Genesis for the benefit of English readers. Strictly speaking, it is not a commentary, as is indicated in the title, and still more fully stated in the preface; but is a series of connected studies. Instead of taking up the text and giving an exegesis of it, he discusses the subject presented, somewhat after the order of Ryle's Notes on the Gospels, though, from the nature of the case, more explanatory, and not so practical as that work.

Being intended for use in Roman Catholic countries, there is, naturally, a good deal bearing upon the errors of Romanists, and hence there is a considerable amount of matter which would strike one living in a Protestant country as more or less foreign to the Book of Genesis. The author takes no pains to conceal the fact that he writes from the

Digitized by Google

conservative standpoint, and in his preface expresses himself in no uncertain terms, but while holding the theory of verbal inspiration very tenaciously, he gives warning that he does not hold himself bound by all the inferences, either of those who advocate, or of those who deny this theory. So far as we remember, there is, in the body of the book not so much as a single reference to the views of the higher critics, and while this may appear very strange in a modern work on Genesis, yet when we consider the end aimed at in the book, the omission is seen to be entirely proper. We repeat, that while the book is not in any sense a critical or exegetical commentary, it can but be helpful and suggestive to any earnest reader.

T. R. ENGLISH.

HAND-BOOK OF PROPHECY. Containing a Brief Outline of the Prophecies of Daniel and John, together with a Critical Essay on the Second Advent. *By James Stacy, D. D.*, Presbyterian Minister, Newnan, Georgia. Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Pp. 149.

The title of this book is rather misleading. It gives the promise of a discussion of the whole field of prophecy, including, of course, Messianic prophecy, but the sub-title informs us that the discussion is to confined to certain predictive prophecies of Daniel and John. An examination of the contents reveals the fact that even the sub-title is not entirely accurate, as only a single brief chapter of ten pages is devoted to the prophecies of Daniel, as introductory merely, while the body of the book is devoted to the prophecies of John.

In his Introduction, the author tells us that it is his purpose "to give a brief outline of the prophecies of John, as usually held by leading interpreters." Who these "leading interpreters" are, we are not told, but evidently they belong to the so-called "historical school," to which the author also belongs, but even within the limits of this school there is a wide range of views, and we doubt not but that many of these interpreters would repudiate some of the positions taken.

One of the most surprising things about the book is the failure to state opposing theories of interpretation, or even to intimate their existence. For example, it is assumed that the fourth kingdom in Daniel's prophecy is the Roman Empire, but there is no intimation that there are any difficulties connected with this view, or that a different reference is maintained by many writers. Again, it is assumed, without a word of argument, that the prophecies of John cover the entire period between the first and second advent, and all theories to the contrary are quiety ignored. The scheme of interpretation presented here is diametrically opposed to the views advocated by many scholars, notably by Professor Swete, in his recent work on Revelation, and in a "hand-book" we naturally expect a statement and refutation of opposing theories, and also a presentation of the grounds upon which we are expected to accept the views presented.

It is not our purpose to discuss the correctness of the author's

Digitized by Google

conclusions, but the confidence with which he refers to certain events in history, as being clearly and unmistakably the fulfilment of certain prophecies, is rather startling, to say the least of it. The Chronological Table on page 95 affords abundant food for thought. According to this table, we are now in the midst of the seventh vial, and the Millennium is scheduled to begin in the year 2,000. The book closes with a critical essay on the Second Coming of Christ, in which the Post-millennial view is advocated.

In many respects the book is an interesting one, and the author has evidently given much thought to the subject, but to one who is not willing to accept mere opinions, without asking that troublesome and impertinent question, "why?" it is disappointing.

T. R. E.

THE FORGOTTEN SECRET. *By W. J. Dawson*, Author of "The Makers of English Fiction," "The Evangelistic Note," etc. New York, Chicago, Toronto. Fleming H. Revell Company, London and Edinburg.

The forgotten secret referred to in the title, is prayer, which, in the judgment of the author, has almost become one of the lost arts, occupying only a subordinate place in the worship of the church, and sadly neglected in private in this pre-eminently strenuous age.

This unpretentious volume, containing about as much matter as an ordinary sermon, is an exposition of the words of the Master: "But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly."—(Matt. vi. 6.) It sets forth clearly and forcibly the nature and benefits of private prayer, and we take pleasure in commending it most cordially as a book for the quiet hour, as well calculated to awaken and stimulate a desire for communion with God. The book derives an added interest from the fact that it was a sermon by the author on this subject that led to the remarkable conversion of Professor Edward Everett Hale.

T. R. ENGLISH.

THE BIRTH AND INFANCY OF JESUS CHRIST. *By Louis Metthews Sweet, M. A.* Published by the Westminster Press, Philadelphia. Pp. 365.

I never heard of the author of this book before. I expect to hear of him again. He is still a young man. Here are the few facts that I have about him. He is a native of Southhold, N. Y., graduated at Hobart College in 1892, and at Auburn Theological Seminary in 1895. After he left the Seminary, he was, for awhile, assistant pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Buffalo, N. Y. At present he is pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Canandaigua, N. Y. I predict that before many years he will be a professor in some theological seminary.

The author does not say so, but I have learned from other sources that this book was written for the Bross Prize, which was given by Lake Forest College in 1905. As most of us remember, the prize was

Digitized by Google

awarded to Professor James Orr, of Glasgow, for his great book, entitled, Problems of the Old Testament. But the second place was given to the book which is now before us. All manuscripts were submitted under fictitious names, so that the weight of a man's name had no influence with the committee. They were guided only by the merits of the book that was before them. It is rather remarkable that so young a man and one who was comparatively unknown, should have ranked above a number of distinguished scholars whose names are known in the whole theological world, and come second to Dr. Orr. The title of the book scarcely suggests its subject. The real subject discussed is the Virgin birth of our Lord. Matthew and Luke are the only writers in the New Testament who make any reference to the Virgin birth. Their accounts have been called in question by many radical critics. Indeed, this subject constitutes one of the storm centers of the theological world just now. Some say that the stories of the infancy of Jesus in Matthew and Luke are additions to their gospels made by a later hand. Others flatly say that the evangelists were mistaken. Still others have other theories. Our author takes these theories up one by one and shows how absurd and impossible they are. This he does in a perfectly calm and sane way. He never rants. He never mistakes sound for sense. But with thorough-going scholarship and invincible logic, pounds these theories one by one into small dust. I wish that all conservatives could adopt the same method. My observation is that conservatives are too apt to mistake denunciation for argument, and rant for scholarship. If we have such a good case, as we believe we have, let us make it out instead of spending our time in ignorant vituperation. I shall never forget a law which I once heard Dr. Ira Remsen formulate: "The amount of heat evolved in a given discussion varies inversely with the amount of light involved."

After the author has demolished the radical theories concerning the Virgin birth, he proceeds to do some splendid constructive work. This is one of the needs of our day. We ought to do more than merely stand on the defensive. We ought to be aggressive for the truth's sake. We should not only tear down the error, but we should fortify the truth more strongly. We might well pray that the Lord would raise up many more young men like the author of this book.

Much is said about the orthodoxy of the young men of the Northern Church. Here is one young man at least who is orthodox to the core, and the best part of his orthodoxy is that it is based on wide reading and broad scholarship, and not simply on the traditions of the fathers. He shows himself a thorough master of the literature of his subject.

This is one of the most important books in the theological world that has been published in recent years. I would advise our young ministers to read it. I have noted, with interest, that Dr. James Orr will deliver a series of lectures on the Virgin birth in April of this year, at Dr. W. W. White's Bible School, in New York. They will afterwards be published in book form.

WALTER L. LINGLE.

Digitized by Google

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT. *By Rev. J. B. Shearer, D. D., LL. D.* Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va., Pp. 146.

I had the privilege of hearing the greater part of this book in the class-room some fifteen years ago, and of standing an examination on it. It was also my privlege to read the advance sheets before it was published. Now I have had the pleasure of reading it in book form. By this time I ought to be a fairly good authority on it. I shall, no doubt, have occasion to open its pages many more times by way of reference. We can not study the Sermon on the Mount too much. If we are going to study it at all, there is no more suggestive book on the subject than this little volume.

First of all, Dr. Shearer gives us the various theories which have been held concerning the Sermon on the Mount, and discusses them briefly. After that he sets forth his own theory. He understands that the Sermon is an arraignment and refutation of Phariseeism, and that the theme of the Sermon is found in Matt. v. 20. With this as the underlying principle, he expounds the entire Sermon. If any one will take the pains to study his book carefully, he will lay it down feeling that Dr. Shearer has made out a good case, and that this theory throws new light on many parts of the Sermon. No doubt there are many who will differ with the author in some of his specific interpretations. For instance, he maintains, in connection with Matt. v. 17, that it was not competent for our Lord when he was on the earth, under the law, to modify the law in any way, either to exalt or lower its demands. "It would have been just as competent for the sinner himself to do so. We say this with all humility." I want to think about that some more. Another instance is in the chapter on divorce, which is an exceedingly interesting and illuminating chapter. Here he holds that the Scriptures permit not only the innocent but the guilty party to marry again. "Under Moses' law both parties may marry again, the guilty party as well as the innocent. The only limitation to their marrying is that they shall never marry each other again. The reasons for this may not be far to see, but they do not come within this discussion. We claim that Christ said nothing different from Moses." All of this sounds strange enough to one living down here in the State of South Carolina, where there are no divorces and no remarriages of either guilty or innocent parties. Indeed, it sounds rather strange to one who was brought up on the Confession of Faith. However, it is well worth thinking about. But these little points are only incidental. The book is a most excellent one, and deserves a wide circulation.

WALTER L. LINGLE.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google